

THE MADRAS LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Friday, 14th December 1923.

The House met at 11 o'clock, the hon. the Deputy President (Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI) in the Chair.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions and answers shall be arranged in order of subjects.

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in the order in which the names are printed, specify the serial numbers of his questions and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

ELECTIONS.

Ganjām bye-election.

39 Q.—MR. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government have taken legal opinion on the question of the effect of the death of a candidate after the date on which polling began but before the date when it was completed, and on the question as to the power of the Government to fix different dates for polling; and

(b) the grounds on which the Government have decided to order a bye-election in Ganjām for only one of the seats, instead of a fresh election for all the three seats?

A.—(a) No.

(b) His Excellency the Governor has decided that, on a true interpretation of the rules, a bye-election should be ordered in the Non-Muhammadan Rural constituency of Ganjām only for the single seat in which a vacancy occurred by the death of Mr. P. Venkateswarulu Pantulu and under Rule 48 of the Madras Electoral Rules his decision is final.

MR. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, may I ask the hon. the Law Member to say whether, before His Excellency the Governor gave a decision on the question, he was consulted by him, or whether he gave him any advice in the matter as the Law Member of the Government?"

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Though it is not usual to ask questions relating to what may be called the internal machinery of the Government, the answer in this case is 'yes'."

[14th December 1923]

EMPIRE EXHIBITION.*Nautch-girls to Empire Exhibition.*

40. Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Minister for Development be pleased to state—

- (a) whether any proposal was placed before him at any time for sending nautch-girls to the British Empire Exhibition, and, if so, by whom;
- (b) what his attitude towards this proposal was at the beginning; and
- (c) whether any money was advanced to nautch-girls, or spent on this account, and, if so, how much?

A.—(a) The answer is in the negative.

(b) The question does not arise.

(c) The answer is in the negative.

IRRIGATION.*Penalty levied for using channel water in certain taluks in Bellary.*

41. Q.—Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(1) the total number of cases and the amount of penalty levied in the Desanur and Siruguppa villages of Bellary taluk, and Kampli and Ramasagaram villages of Hospet taluk, Bellary district, for alleged unauthorized use, without previous permission, of the channel water for double crop on single crop wet lands;

(2) whether in every case an application is made for water and sanctioned by the Government, the latter guaranteeing to the ryot concerned, the necessary quantity of water reasonably required for him for his crop to grow and mature; and

(3) whether during any of the five years preceding the introduction of the rule requiring an application for water in all cases where double crops are grown on single crop wet lands, the crops on any field or fields suffered damage owing to a larger extent than was reasonable being cultivated with double crops instead of a single crop and, if so, the number of such cases and the amount of charge for water for the second crops remitted in each year?

A.—(1) Government have not the information asked for.

(2) The system of water applications was introduced in 1922.

The acceptance of a water application does not guarantee the supply of any definite supply of water since this would be dependant on the season.

(3) The trouble which led to the introduction of water applications arose in connexion with the cultivation of sugarcane, which resulted in shortage of water during the last period of the crop. The Government have no information as to the number of cases of damage to crops or the amount of the remission granted during the period in question.

Mr. P. PEDDIRAJU :—“ May I ask the hon. the Law Member if he will inquire into the number of cases referred to in question 41 (1), and call for a report? ”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ Yes.”

14th December 1923]

Report of Mr. Clegg's Committee on irrigation.

42 Q.—Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether there is a complaint against the adequacy of the four-inch pipe in the Gōdāvari delta ;

(b) whether any attempt has hitherto been made in this connexion to meet the demands of the ryots of the area and whether the recommendations of Mr. Clegg's Committee have been given effect to in full ;

(c) whether any further action has been taken in the matter ; and

(d) whether the Government will be pleased to place on the table of this Council copies of the report of Mr. Clegg's Committee and of the orders passed by Government thereon and of subsequent orders, if any ?

A.—(a), (b) & (c) The Government are aware that there is a complaint against the adequacy of the four-inch pipes in the Gōdāvari delta. To satisfy the requirements of the ryots, the Clegg Committee's recommendations have been given effect to as far as practicable. It has been considered that the re-piping should be done together with remodelling, and the matter is receiving the attention of the local officers. The Member's attention is invited to the Press Communiqué issued in February 1916.

(d) The Government consider that no useful purpose will be served by placing the Clegg Committee's report on the table now.

Irrigation of lands situated at the tail-end of long channels.

43 Q.—Rai Bahadur Sir K. VENKATAREDDI NAYUDU : Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether the Government are aware of the difficulty experienced by ryots in irrigating their lands which are situated at the tail-ends of long channels, which take off from the lower reaches of the main canals in the Gōdāvari delta ;

(b) whether the Government have taken any action towards alleviating the distress complained of in this connexion ; and

(c) whether any grant has been made to improve the supply in the channels so situated during the last five years ?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The difficulties referred to are experienced in many of the longer channels, elsewhere as well as in the Gōdāvari delta. The cause is invariably the fact that more water than is actually required is drawn off to lands more favourably situated nearer the head of the channel. The remedy is the remodelling and re-piping of the channel, to improve the duty at which the upper part of the channel works, and thus to ensure more equitable distribution. This is usually objected to by the owners of lands under the upper part of the channel. A certain amount of work has been done and is in progress in the Gōdāvari delta in the direction indicated.

[14th December 1923]

- (c) During the last five years capital expenditure amounting to Rs. 77,940 has been incurred on the remodelling of channels, and additional expenditure from revenue on re-piping, the details of which are not available.

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT.

Construction of General Hospital at Mangalore.

44 Q.—Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(i) when the construction of the new General Hospital in Mangalore is likely to commence; and

(ii) whether the Government will consider the advisability of erecting a separate hospital for women and children at Mangalore and providing the necessary funds therefor in the next Budget?

A.—(i) The Government are not in a position to state definitely when work on the new combined hospital at Mangalore is likely to be commenced. A comprehensive programme of new works required in the medical department has been prepared and the works have, after careful consideration, been arranged in the order of urgency under four different classes:—

- (1) Very emergent.
- (2) Emergent.
- (3) Ordinary.
- (4) Desirable, but which can be delayed.

The Mangalore hospital is included in class (3) Ordinary. In view of the present financial stringency, the Government are not in a position to provide money for any works included in classes (3) and (4).

(ii) On the recommendation of the Surgeon-General, the Government have decided that the new hospital to be constructed at Mangalore should be a combined institution the female half of which will be separated from the male half by a wall and be in charge of a lady-doctor. The Government do not consider it necessary to erect a separate hospital for women and children.

Filling up of the Tanjore District Board Presidentship.

45 Q.—Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Minister for Local Self-Government be pleased to state—

(a) why the Presidentship of the District Board of Tanjore that fell vacant in June last remains unfilled by nomination or election, while those of Chittoor, Godavari, Coimbatore and Chingleput where vacancies arose either contemporaneously or subsequently have been promptly filled up;

(b) whether it is intended to fill up the Presidentship of the Tanjore District Board shortly; and

(c) whether in the matter of filling up these vacancies any principle or policy is involved?

14th December 1923]

- A.—(a) Four of the eight taluk boards in the Tanjore district were re-constituted on an elective basis with effect from 15th August 1923 and the election of members from all the taluk boards took some time after that date.
- (b) The Government have decided to authorize the members of the Tanjore District Board to elect their President. The requisite notification will be published in the *Fort St. George Gazette* of the 8th January 1924; and
- (c) the answer is in the affirmative.

NON-BRAHMANS.

The Nellore Non-Brahman Conference.

46 Q.—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

- (a) whether they have received a copy of the resolutions passed at the First Nellore District Non-Brahman Conference;
- (b) whether it is a fact that one of the resolutions passed in that Conference was to the effect that the constructive programme of the Congress should be given effect to; and
- (c) whether the Government has any intention of giving effect to any extent whatever to the abovementioned resolution?

A.—(a) The Government have not received a copy of the resolutions referred to.

(b) & (c) The questions do not arise.

REVENUE DIVISIONS.

Re-adjustment of revenue divisions and taluks in the Nellore district.

47 Q.—Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to lay on the table the proposals submitted by the Collector of Nellore for the re-adjustment of the revenue divisions and taluks in the Nellore district and the orders passed thereon?

A.—The proposals made by the Collector of Nellore are under the consideration of Government. When they have considered the proposals, any changes contemplated will be published in the District Gazette for public criticism. The Government do not therefore consider it necessary to lay on the table the proposals made by the Collector.

REVENUE ESTABLISHMENT.

Abolition of four Deputy Tahsildars in the Coimbatore district.

48 Q.—Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

- (a) whether the Government have authorized the Collector of Coimbatore (1) to publish their intention to abolish four Deputy Tahsildars' offices in the Coimbatore district and (2) to call for objections regarding the same;

[14th December 1923]

(b) whether the Government have any objection to publish the Collector's report on the matter referred to in clause (a) above for public criticism before arriving at a final decision in the matter ;

(c) what was the number of criminal cases on the file of each of the four Deputy Tahsildars above referred to in 1921 and 1922 both as regards Calendar and Register cases ;

(d) whether objections have been received against the proposal regarding all or any of these offices ;

(e) whether the Bench Courts having jurisdiction to try petty cases from the villages are now under the jurisdiction of those Deputy Tahsildars ; and, if so, the headquarters where the Bench Courts are located ;

(f) whether any objection has been received against these Bench Courts trying cases from such villages ; and if so, whether the Government have passed final orders, or whether the matter is still under consideration ;

(g) if final orders have already been passed on the matter referred to in (f) above, whether the Government have any intention to reconsider the matter ; and

(h) whether there is any proposal to constitute Bench Courts at the present headquarters of these Deputy Tahsildars if their offices are removed ?

A.—(a) Yes.

(b) The proposal having been published for the information of the public and their criticisms invited and duly considered, the Government do not think it necessary to publish the Collector's report.

(c) The number of criminal cases on the file of each of the four Deputy Tahsildars in 1921 is given below. The figures for 1922 are not available—

					Calendar cases and register cases.
(1)	Perundurai	554
(2)	Kangayam	287
(3)	Satyamangalam	396
(4)	Mettupalayam	289

(d) Yes, in respect of all the four offices.

(e) No.

(f) & (g) Does not arise.

(h) The proposal cannot obviously be considered until orders are passed on the abolition of the offices referred to.

SETTLEMENT.

Resettlement proposals in the Tanjore district.

49 Q.—MR. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state whether the resettlement proposals of Tanjore district will be stayed pending legislation on general settlement of revenue in the Presidency ?

A.—The Government see no reason to adopt the course suggested.

14th December 1923]

TAXATION.

Fresh taxation.

50 Q.—Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: Will the hon. Member for Finance be pleased to state whether the Government have any proposals of fresh taxation for the next financial year?

A.—As at present advised, the Government hope that it will not be necessary to introduce fresh taxation next year.

II

MOTIONS FOR REAPPROPRIATION FOR 1923-24.

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I would like to raise a point of order, Sir, if I may, or rather two points of order, if you will kindly allow me to do so."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT:—"Yes."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"My first point of order, Sir, is this: that no Motion for a grant of money by this House can be made except on a Message from His Excellency the Governor, which Message, according to the terms of the Government of India Act, should be communicated to this Council under section 72-D (2) (c) which runs thus:

'No proposal for the appropriation of any such revenues or other moneys for any purpose shall be made except on the recommendation of the Governor, communicated to the Council.'

"Now, I would respectfully invite you, Sir, to turn to Standing Order No. 69 under which communications from the Governor to the Council are made. Standing Order No. 69 says:

'Communications from the Governor to the Council are made—

- (1) by a speech; and
- (2) by a written message.'

"As far as I see at present, Sir, subject to correction by the Treasury Bench, I see no communication from the Governor, either by a speech, or by a written message. I may invite your attention, Sir, to the Message remitting the Religious Endowments Bill back to us when a Message was read to this Council by the hon. the President signed by His Excellency Lord Willingdon. I, therefore, put it to you, Sir, as a point of order that this Motion, which my hon. Friend the Law Member wants to make, is out of order in the absence of a communication from the Governor which, if I may say so respectfully, according to the terms of the Government of India Act, must be communicated to this Council, and that communication can be only by a speech, or by a written message; and I have no doubt, Sir, that it does not require any stretch of interpretation of language to say that the speech can be made only by His Excellency the Governor, or that a written message can only be written or signed by him. I do not think that Parliament contemplated the idea, when they gave this power to the Governor, that His Excellency should be allowed to delegate it to the Members of his Cabinet. I, therefore, suggest, Sir, that it is a very important matter which will have to be very carefully considered—as I have no doubt it will be—and a ruling given. I suggest, therefore, that this Motion is wholly out of order."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Mr. Deputy President, though it is a point of order and the decision of this question is entirely vested in you, I take it that you will permit me to offer a few remarks."

[14th December 1923]

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ Yes.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ Mr. Deputy President, under section 72 D (2) (c) at page 53 of that volume to which advertence is made—

‘ no proposal for the appropriation of any such revenues . . . shall be made except on the recommendation of the Governor, communicated to the Council.’

“ What is, therefore, needed is a recommendation. There is a distinction made and that distinction has been observed during the whole series of grants in the lifetime of the last Council between a ‘ communication ’ in the technical sense of the word used in the Standing Orders and a ‘ recommendation.’ It is true that under Standing Order 69, at page 80 of Volume II communications from the Governor to the Council are made either by a speech, or by a written message. The word ‘ communicated ’ in the Government of India Act is used not as necessarily involving, or implying, any such communication under Standing Order 69. The distinction, I take it, Mr. Deputy President, is that in the case of financial business, there is a recommendation by the Governor. That recommendation is conveyed by Members of the Reserved or the Transferred half of the Government to the Council. That recommendation is not stated to have as an obligatory feature of it any special message or speech from His Excellency the Governor. All that the Government of India Act requires is that it should be communicated to the Council and that it should be a recommendation from the Governor. From my place here I assure the Council that there has been a recommendation of the Governor; it has been communicated through me to the Council. The verb ‘ communicated ’ is not necessarily to be read as involving or amounting to what have been termed ‘ communications ’ under the Standing Order which applies to the formal ‘ communications ’ which His Excellency the Governor desires to make as head of the Province to the Council. It is that kind of communications that is referred to there in saying that communications are made by a speech or by a written message. Quite apart from that, if we have to follow precedents, undoubtedly you will allow this circumstance, to weigh with you, Mr. Deputy President, that during the lifetime of the last Council, these recommendations have been made in this way, and I would ask you, Sir, to give a ruling on that basis. That is my submission.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I know I cannot speak except with your indulgence, Sir. But if you will be so good as to give me another chance of saying just two or three words in answer to the hon. the Law Member, I shall be much obliged.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ With great respect, if I may intervene at this stage, Sir, I may say that these points of order are entirely at your disposal and discretion.”

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ It is a point of order, no doubt. But such communications were made hitherto in the last Council through the Members of Government; and if precedents would sanctify proceedings, then I would consider the procedure now followed by the hon. the Law Member to be in order. The precedents are all in his favour. The rules have been interpreted as he interprets them to-day. So, I will decide the matter in his favour and ask him to proceed.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I bow to your ruling, Sir; but may I ask one question just to make the position clear?”

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ I am afraid I have given my ruling, right or wrong, and no further questions should be put.”

14th December 1923]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I raise another point of order, Sir ?"

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" Yes ; if you like."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" My next point of order is this, Sir. Section 72 D(2) of the Government of India Act contemplates that—

' the proposals of the local Government for the appropriation of provincial revenues and other moneys in any year shall be submitted to the Vote of the Council in the form of demands for grants.'

" That is the governing section there. Now, if you will be so good as to turn to the Legislative Council Rules, Sir, Rule 26 deals with Demands for Grants (*vide* page 164 of Volume I). Then, Rule 32 deals with what are known as Supplementary or Additional Grants. I shall read to you, Sir, Rule 32, which runs thus :—

' 32 (1). An estimate shall be presented to the Council for a supplementary or additional grant when—

- (i) the amount voted in the Budget of a grant is found to be insufficient for the purpose of the current year, or
- (ii) a need arises during the current year for expenditure for which the Vote of the Council is necessary upon some new service not contemplated in the Budget for that year.'

" These are the only two Rules, Sir, under which the Government can come to this House, either for Grants at Budget time, or for what are known as Supplementary or Additional Grants. If you will be so good, Sir, as to turn to the Order of the Day, you will find that these things come under ' Motions for Reappropriation '. My first submission to you, Sir, is this, that there is no provision, either in the Act, or under the Rules, for these Motions for Reappropriation. If you will permit me, Sir, to refer to the Explanatory Memorandum of the hon. the Finance Member submitted to this House two days ago, I believe he refers there to Rule 34, clause (2), in which the provision reads thus :—

' 34 (2) It shall be the duty of the Committee to bring to the notice of the Council—

- (i) every reappropriation from one grant to another grant.'

" I therefore, submit, Sir, that this Grant must come merely as a Supplementary Grant under one or other of the two clauses, of Rule 32 as a supplementary or additional grant. There is no power for the Government to move for a reappropriation in this Council, and there is no power in this Council under the Act or under the Rules to sanction a reappropriation from one grant to another at this stage. Of course, if you will permit the hon. Members of the Government to modify the Grants now as merely Additional Grants, it is perfectly open to you, Sir, but so long as they are not modified, and so long as they stand merely as Reappropriations, I submit most respectfully that neither the Act nor the Rules contemplate such Demands or Reappropriations, as they are called, being made. I, therefore, Sir, request you to give a ruling on that matter."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" The words ' to be provided from savings under Grant VIII. General Administration ' refer to the grant from which the reappropriation is made. Those words were inserted mainly for the purpose of enabling the House to know what the hon. the Finance Member intended to do and how he proposed to provide for it. It was so to say for the purpose of imparting certain information to the Council. There is a great deal of point in what has fallen from the hon. Member for the University in regard to the technical procedure

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar] [14th December 1923]

that these are extra, supplemental or additional grants. It is because they are extra, supplemental or additional grants and we are seeking to provide for the payment of those grants, that the expression 'Reappropriation' has been used, and the explanation 'to be provided for under Grant' has been added. These may be treated as surplusage, and all these grants may be taken as additional or supplemental grants. With your leave, Mr. Deputy President, I would like to say a few words."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" Yes."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" The same point was raised by the hon. Member for Kistna, Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao, in the last Council, and I think—I am, of course, speaking subject to correction—I think a ruling was given on this matter. The same question arose whether the word 'Reappropriation' may be used, and according to that decision the words 'to be provided under,' etc., were used.

" The point is that we do not want to exaggerate our total expenditure. Supposing we ask for a Supplementary Grant, the Council will be under the impression that in addition to the original budget allotment, we are asking for extra expenditure. All those explanatory words were added in order to show that we are able to provide funds for the purpose out of the savings in the Grant mentioned. It was with that object that those words were used. But I have no reason to object to the exclusion of those words."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" The hon. the Law Member will proceed."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I take it, Sir, that that is the ruling on my point of order ? "

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" Yes, in the light of the explanation given by the hon. the Law Member."

Grant VI.

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Sir, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor, I now move—

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 14,300 under 'Irrigation—Civil Officers—Reserved' to be provided from savings under Grant VIII—General Administration—Reserved.

" If hon. Members will turn to page 5 of the Memorandum of the hon. the Finance Member, which has been placed on the table of the Council, they will see that there were certain urgent repairs in regard to certain minor irrigation works which had to be undertaken in order that the neglect of those necessary repairs may not result in damage. I see that no Amendment has been tabled, and I therefore move that the Government be granted that sum."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" Sir, this is a Motion made for the additional allotment of Rs. 14,300 for what are known as minor irrigation works in charge of civil officers. If I like at this stage to make a few remarks on this Motion, it is because there has been a feeling expressed in this House for some time past that the expenditure under the head 'Minor Irrigation Works' has been very unsatisfactory. I wish to draw the attention of this House . . ."

14th December 1923]

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" May I ask the hon. Member whether he means insufficient or unsatisfactory ? "

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—" The expenditure is unsatisfactory for important reasons, the amount provided is insufficient, and the way in which it is distributed is also open to grave objections. I shall make the point clear as I proceed. I will draw the attention of the House to the fact that at the time when the hon. Member for Revenue asked for a grant of Rs. 8.18 lakhs under this head, I raised this question about the expenditure on minor irrigation works by a Motion for reduction of the total allotment by Rs. 100. It would be clear from the discussion which took place on that occasion that, whereas out of that amount of Rs. 8 lakhs and odd, over two lakhs was taken up for establishment charges, the amount provided for works alone was less than six lakhs. We wanted to ascertain as to whether explanation was given about the various minor irrigation works scattered over the several districts in the province, whether statements were made as to how many of them were out of repair and whether there was a regular programme for setting them in order, and as to whether the Council would be furnished with more information. In the course of the discussion, the hon. the Member for Revenue was able to state thus :

' Nobody would be gladder than myself if the financial position of the province would permit larger sums being spent on minor irrigation works. That will certainly conduce to the welfare and happiness of the ryot, but we have to cut our coat according to the cloth.'

" Having stated that, he could not, owing to the exigencies of finance, provide for minor irrigation works to the extent to which he would desire. He stated that he could not give a correct idea as to the principles upon which provision was made. This is what he stated :

' However, some time ago the Government took pains to find out what the average expenditure on minor irrigation works should be. It was impossible, of course, to decide by any rule of thumb how much money should be spent in a particular district and how much money should not be spent. However, the Government laid down a certain formula. Every Collector before budgeting for the amount of money required for minor irrigation works was to observe this formula. That formula was that in the case of the wet lands the expenditure should be at the rate of 12 annas per acre and in the case of the single crop land it should be 6 annas per acre. Although this formula was laid down, the Collectors were at the same time authorized to budget for more or less, indicating the reason for the departure from the formula.'

" Now, I wish to raise this question as to the expenditure on minor irrigation works whether they have been observing the formula suggested, whether it is the one that has to be applied, or whether it meets the requirements of minor irrigation in each of the districts and whether the necessary provision has been made. If I now wish to object to this Grant, it is because, after the discussion which took place on this subject, the Resolution was finally lost, it is necessary for us to have an account as to whether minor irrigation works have been looked after adequately during this year. When the attention of the hon. Member for Revenue has already been drawn to the unsatisfactory way in which proper account was not taken of the various small minor irrigation repairs, it is now due to the House that when coming for additional grants for minor irrigation you should convince us that necessary enquiries have been made and action has been taken with regard to wells and all other minor irrigation tanks, and that due provision has been made for the repair of those works which have been out of repair, and if it is for the purpose of carrying out that object that additional money is now required, I think, Sir, that the information placed before us is very meagre that Collectors have asked for these grants as you find on page 5 of the Memorandum.

[Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu] [14th December 1923]

I think we are entitled to know what the Government has done during the year when objection has already been taken against the insufficient expenditure of money, and till we know it, we cannot be called upon to support this proposal."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I rise to oppose this Motion, not so much upon the merits of the particular Grant asked for, as upon the haphazard, unbusiness-like way in which the budget of this Government seems to be drafted and the way in which supplementary demands are made. Because there is a provision in the Government of India Act and in the Devolution Rules regulating the procedure, they cannot, without taking any precautions at the time of the framing of the budget, simply come to this Council at the last moment and say ' I want this Grant '. I think this is against all considerations of public finance in all Responsible Governments. I want hon. Members to look into the Note prepared by the hon. the Finance Member in explanation of this Motion, wrongly called by a new term ' Reappropriation '. Sir, hon. Members will find that except for Madura, where a paltry sum of Rs. 800 is wanted for repairs to breaches caused by the monsoon, all other incidents could have been, and ought to have been, foreseen. For Guntur the budget allotment has been found to be insufficient and the Collector spent in the first half-year 84 per cent of the allotment sanctioned for the district. If you ask ' Why do you want more money ? ', the answer is, ' Because I have spent it '. It is like a schoolboy answering when he is asked why he came late, ' Sir, I came late. ' Certainly it is not an answer to be expected from a Responsible Government Executive. Why did not the Government know that so much money would be wanted ? To say suddenly ' I spent the money and I want more money, ' is ridiculous. It seems to me that unless they give certain definite reasons why they could not have been able to foresee this, this House ought not to convert itself into a House for registering the decrees of the Executive. Again, for Ramnad, it is said in a delightfully vague way that ' the amount is required for repairs to some urgent small works. "

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" The Executive may have been responsible for many iniquities, but it is not responsible for the breaching of tanks. "

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I appreciate the joke. If really tanks were breached, I take it the hon. Member is bound to tell this House why they allowed the tanks to be breached. I cannot understand the hon. Member, when he is challenged, answering by a joke. Here they have not told us that the tanks have breached. "

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" I thought the hon. Member's complaint was that we did not give those particulars. "

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" I cannot catch the hon. Member. Then we come to Chingleput where it is said :

' the budget allotment has been found insufficient, as much as 69 per cent of the allotment having been spent during the first half of the year '

" Here again the stereotyped answer. Why did you not foresee those things ? You have got a whole staff of experienced officers, you have got a whole staff of experts. I therefore think that Government ought to have been more careful in framing its budget before coming to this House for these Supplementary Grants and treating them as a normal procedure. I am most anxious that this House should vote against this Motion as a reminder to the

14th December 1923]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

Executive that this House is not going to let these things go so easily and merely register their whims whenever they wanted money. Rule 32 of the Legislative Council Rules clearly says :

‘ An estimate shall be presented to the Council for a supplementary or additional grant when (i) the amount voted in the Budget of a grant is found to be insufficient for the purposes of the current year, or, (ii) a need arises during the current year for expenditure for which the Vote of the Council is necessary upon some new service not contemplated in the Budget for that year.’

“ I therefore submit that the hon. the Law Member is bound to tell this House what are the new circumstances which were not taken into account, and which could not be taken into account, at the time of the framing of the Budget, but which have since happened. Therefore, I think, Sir, that we cannot blindfold tell the Executive that they can live as in the old days. And though we have not now that financial control we ought to have, and although those powers are truncated, still this House has some power and is going to assert it.”

11-30 a.m. Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ Mr. Deputy President, Sir, if there were any justification for the statement made by the bureaucracy that educated Indians hardly know of practical administration and are not responsible for the wild statements made about the Financial and other Departments, I think the speech of my hon. and learned Friend for the University affords ample justification. His speech is one which reveals his colossal ignorance, both of the elementary principles of financial working and the principles of detailed administrative knowledge. Sir, the hon. Member said that in no civilized Government will the administration come forward for a supplementary demand.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I never said anything of the kind. The hon. Member has been carried away by his eloquence and forgot what I said. I said that there is no Government in the world which will come forward with a supplementary demand without stating that there were new circumstances which they could not have foreseen.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ I do not see much difference. I leave my hon. Friend representing the cultured electorate of the University there. He is not a humble Member of a mass electorate like mine.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Mine also is.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ I must say that if the hon. Member had known something more of how financial matters are being carried on in other civilized Governments, he would not have come forward with the theories he propounded. Sir, in England the financial business of the country is done in a very different state from what is done here. There are motions introduced by responsible Ministers of Government. For instance, when the air service was newly started in 1920, the hon. Minister introduced a token motion that the Government be granted £ 100. On that being granted, he spent several millions and later on came with a supplementary demand. This is the thing that is done in all civilized Governments. The Budget is prepared months before for the coming months. The Budget is prepared by heads of departments for the next current year. If it is remembered how the Budget is got up, it will be remembered how difficult it is to foresee things many months beforehand. The particular item which the hon. Member for the University has taken hold of is a very unfortunate item. It is one of the many items

[Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar] [14th December 1923]

which is impossible for any Collector to foresee either the tenth or one hundredth part of the real cost because the items are several in number and spread over the whole district area. Moreover, these supplementary grants are intended to satisfy the unforeseen expenditure that may arise in the course of the year. So there is absolutely nothing wrong in the Government coming forward for a supplementary grant for an item which could not have been foreseen. It is all very well to say that business capacity requires that these things should have been foreseen. But anyone who has known what it is to prepare a Budget estimate for the coming eighteen months will really know the difficulty in estimating the cost of maintaining a particular department. That the forecast which the head of an administration makes in October of this year ought to come to the exact pie in April of 1925 is what he means. Therefore, I do not see any point which the hon. Member has made and therefore this grant should be passed without any division."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" I must say that I was somewhat surprised at the tenor of the remarks which fell from the hon. Member for the University. I realize to the full the implications of what he said that this Council will no longer be silent. So far as that is concerned, there can be no two opinions on that point. (Laughter). Then there was something about schoolboys coming late. While the bureaucracy of which I happen to be a temporary Member has been accused of many enormities, it has never been accused of funk and it is not in a spirit of cowardice that this Motion for a supplementary demand has been made. Therefore, there is no particular reason for our giving excuses or evasive answers even from questions arising from the non-silent Member for the University. Then there was an eloquent discourse on public finance as conducted in other countries and the great shortcomings in the Madras way of administration. I am indebted to my hon. Colleague, the Finance Member, for what takes place in the mother of Parliaments. It has been said with reference to England :

' The unforeseen does happen ; emergencies arise, and it is seldom that the original estimates are found to meet all the needs of the year for which they were intended to provide. It would be strange if they did, because they are prepared in October and November to meet the needs of a year which begins in the following April and so does not end until some fifteen months later than the time at which the estimates were settled. Some fresh need for expenditure, unforeseen and unprovided for in the estimates, may be expected to occur in the course of the fifteen months. When it does, to provide for it one or more Supplementary Estimates are introduced towards the end of the financial year, in February or March.'

" Mr. Deputy President, I plead guilty to the charge of following the example of the House of Commons. If that is a sin,—well I am sinning. Then it was stated, why were not all these included in the regular programme? Cyclones are not pertinently speaking in the regular programme of this Presidency. The breaching and demolition of bunds are things over which we have no normal control in this Presidency. There is one other point I wish to lay much stress upon, because the hon. and eloquent Member for the University being a new Member may not be aware that there has always been a kind of struggle between the various departments for getting money. The Irrigation Department, the portfolio of which I have been in charge, has been waging ceaseless conflicts with my hon. Colleague, the Finance Member. It does succeed often, though partially, and I am glad to say has succeeded. It may be little. But none will get all that one wants. The fact of the matter is that irrigation demands more money than they get and that is why we are not able to distribute grants as equitably as all of us are anxious to do.

14th December 1923] [Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar]

Speaking for myself, I should like to see the grants doubled. But then we have to see that the financial needs of the Province and the many demands that are made by the progressive departments administered by my colleagues to the right have to be satisfied. It is because of this circumstance that minor irrigation works have not got an allotment which they are entitled to get in my opinion and which they may get in some prosperous year. In the meanwhile, unforeseen contingencies occur and certain tanks on which we had not spent money to attend to the maintenance and improvement now breach. Some of these might not have occurred if money had been spent already. It is that circumstance of financial stringency or crisis that has been at the bottom of this unforeseen expenditure.

"I now proceed to another point and I am glad to clear the points raised by the hon. Member from Nellore. He stated that there was a controversy raised as to the overmanning of some of these establishments and he wanted to know what has been done in this matter. That question will come in the Public Accounts Committee. As a matter of fact, it has been felt that in some respects the minor irrigation establishments have been overstaffed and certain retrenchments have been suggested. When my hon. Friend from Nellore sees those particulars, he will be satisfied that no stone has been left unturned in respect of the overstaffing question. Then, Sir, I was invited to give particulars. It is easy to have given the particulars; but it was taken that when responsible Collectors ask for sums like Rs. 9,000, 800 and 1,500 spread over their respective districts, they ought to be well known to the Members of this House and there will be no reason for giving full particulars. But inasmuch as the question has been asked, I proceed to give the answers. In Guntur Rs. 9,620 was required for repairs. It was not for anything else but for urgently required repairs. The major portion of the urgent works have been allotted and damages will result if they are not carried on. The Collector spent in the first half-year 84 per cent of the allotment sanctioned for the district. It means that he nearly requires twice as much in order to carry on the works undertaken by the department. He says unless you give something more, you cannot have the tanks and wells repaired. So we come to the Council. Can we turn round and ask which tank are you going to repair? Those particulars cannot be demanded now. At a later stage, when hon. Members wanted to bombard the Treasury Bench, which they are certainly entitled to do, the particulars will be given. A sum of Rs. 7,300 was given to Madura for repairs of breaches caused by the monsoon. Rupees 6,520 have already been given. Still Rs. 800 is required for breaches caused by the monsoon. The Collector, in the first half of the year, has spent 69 per cent of the allotment. Ramnad wants Rs. 1,500 for repairs of small works. The Collector has demanded it after surrendering it at one time on the ground that he would not require it. After surrendering Rs. 2,500 on account of the monsoon, he wanted more money. So he wants Rs. 1,500 out of the surrendered money. Mr. Galletti applied for Rs. 25,000 for new works. We cannot give even half of that. Subsequently he asked for Rs. 3,000. Honourable Members will see that in the case of these works Government, on account of their financial position, gave much less than the amount actually needed for these repairs. It is because of the past stringent financial policy that we have to ask for money now, and I take it that there will be no objection even on the part of the eloquent Member for the University."

The Motion was put and carried and the Grant was made.

[14th December 1923]

Grant VII.

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Sir, on the recommendation
11-45 a.m. of His Excellency the Governor, I move—

*That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 28,755 under
"Irrigation—Public Works Officers—Reserved" to be provided from
savings under Grant VIII—General Administration—Reserved.*

"Hon. Members may require some particulars on this matter. In reply to a question which emanated from an hon. Member, I stated that the Cauvery-Metur project is well on its way towards settlement. The technical advisers of the Madras and Mysore Governments have met and have agreed upon certain terms. The matter itself is under consideration by the two Governments. If and as soon as the agreement between the two Governments is ratified, we shall push on that scheme. The result of the scheme will be that Pattukkottai taluk in the Tanjore districts will be one of the gardens of India. Incidentally some other tracts will also be greatly benefited. Above all, the present uncertainty with regard to the irrigation of the existing deltaic area in the Tanjore district will disappear; because we shall have a reservoir which will meet all unforeseen contingencies. In order to explore that and in order to revise the estimates which were originally made so that they may be ready to go to the Government of India, we had to employ a special officer. Some hon. Members may put the question, 'why was not this foreseen'? It was not foreseen for these reasons: It was at one time apprehended that the difficulties in the way of the Madras and Mysore Governments agreeing to this scheme were well nigh insuperable and before May or June it looked as if we might have to resort to arbitration which would have taken years and years. But thanks to the cordial co-operation of the Mysore Darbar represented by its Diwan and the indefatigable efforts of this Government, some way was found out of the difficulty. The scheme got to the stage of maturity and we had to prepare revised estimates so that they may be sent to the Government for sanction. It is with reference to that that we had to incur expenditure in regard to the Special Engineer. Having entertained the Special Engineer, the Madras Government came to the conclusion that one of the great projects which had been held in abeyance and portions of which had been dealt with by successive Chief Engineers and also in Morgan's report, might be carried on and the various parts co-ordinated so as to make a great project. What has been styled the Sangameswaram project in the Kurnool district is done by practically bringing the Kistna and the Tungabhadra waters right across the Presidency down to the Cooum and it is probably going to be the greatest of the irrigation works in India, if not the world. As a necessary preliminary to it we have to obtain the sanction of His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government in order to conduct some operations in his territory. Also the Government of India Expert is coming down in December or January to look into the scheme and advise this Government as to the feasibility and the expediency of embarking on that great project. It is technically not necessary to get his previous sanction but as we are going to spend something like 25 crores of rupees on that project—it may be even more, this is only a rough estimate—we thought it would be well beforehand to get the consent of the Irrigation Expert of the Government of India, so that there might not be any difficulty afterwards. It is for these reasons that this money is asked for."

14th December 1923]

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ May I ask for an information, Sir? What necessity was there to engage a retired official as the Special Engineer for three months at a cost of Rs. 3,000 a month, if it was merely for the purpose of revising an estimate according to current rates? I can well understand going in for a senior officer like that for the purpose of investigation or for framing original estimates. When investigations have been completed and estimates have been prepared, merely for the purpose of revising those estimates according to the current rates, one will expect that even an Assistant Engineer would have been sufficient. But here a retired Chief Engineer has been engaged for the purpose and I think this requires some explanation.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ May I ask, Sir, for further information as to why the Government should not have extended the term of the retiring Chief Engineer instead of appointing a new Chief Engineer and employing the retiring Engineer as a Special Engineer? One salary would have been sufficient if the term of the previous Engineer was extended.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ I shall first answer my hon. Friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar. We are not entitled to extend the term of the office of the Chief Engineer beyond a certain period without the sanction of the Secretary of State. That was why we had to appoint him as a special officer.

“ I shall now turn to the question propounded by my hon. Friend, the Raja of Ramnad. The Sangameswaram project had to be investigated by Mr. Ramalinga Ayyar as he was thoroughly acquainted with the previous history of this project and had made a special study of it. He has been specialising on that for months before he retired. It was a pity he had to retire when that project had to be finally pushed through and it was in order to enable him to complete that particular investigation and also for another purpose which I will presently mention, that he was appointed as special officer. The original estimate for the Mettur project was found to be totally insufficient having regard to the recent increase in prices and having regard also to newer ideas. Hon. Members will see that there is a difference of about a crore of rupees between the original estimate and the present estimate as revised. Having regard to the conditions prevailing at the time when the original estimate was prepared and to the conditions when the final estimates are got ready for scrutiny by the Government, it practically became a new estimate. It was not without hesitation that this course was adopted; but it was felt that the experience of an officer who had specialised in this project should not be missed. As a matter of fact, Mr. Morgan thought that the Sangameswaram project would not be a success. But Mr. Ramalinga Ayyar dared to differ from Mr. Morgan. Therefore, on account of the difference of opinion between two eminent engineers, we had to invite the opinion of the Government of India expert. It is to satisfy ourselves and because this gentleman who was about to retire had pushed the work to a certain point and convinced us of the utility and feasibility of this great scheme, having differed from his predecessors who did not think that the scheme was feasible, it is to achieve this purpose that we engaged his services for a further period, i.e., merely and solely to allow him to complete his investigation and to leave on record the results of his investigation.”

The RAJA OF RAMNAD :—“ It was stated before that he was appointed for the purpose of revising the estimates according to the current rates. I therefore said that for such a work the ordinary officer of the Public Works

[The Raja of Ramnad]

[14th December 1923]

Department would be enough. But now from what the hon. the Law Member has stated, we find that practically the whole work is being revised, which may include also alteration in the various structures connected with the scheme. If that were so, it will be an original investigation and this statement cannot be correct."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"There is no question of altering the structures. This is a revised estimate having regard to the progress of time between the date of original estimates and the present time and having regard to the newer ideas."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, I understand from the hon. the Law Member's remarks that to extend the time of the tenure of office of the Chief Engineer, the sanction of the Secretary of State for India is necessary. May I know, Sir, what prevented the hon. the Law Member from getting such a sanction?"

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"By the time that we get the sanction his term would be up and we came to the conclusion that we could appoint him as special officer for three months."

Mr. SAMI VENKATACHALAM CHETTIYAR:—"Even by cable, Mr. Deputy President?"

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Even telegrams on such important topics cannot be answered for months."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, I am absolutely unrepentant even after the castigation by the hon. Member from Chingleput who seemed to think that he combined in himself all the virtues an educated Indian should have for responsible Government."

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR:—"I deny that charge, Sir."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Apart from that, I still ask my hon. Friend the hon. the Law Member why he should take this extraordinary step of coming to this House for supplementary estimates unless there is some compelling cause of urgency which cannot wait till March next. If hon. Members will kindly turn to the note prepared by the hon. the Finance Member, at page 6, they will find, as the Raja of Ramnad has already pointed out, the only work under the Cauvery-Mettur project is to have the 'project estimates revised in accordance with current rates'."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Unless we send the estimates for sanction by January, the work cannot be started soon. I want to start the work, if possible, by February or March. Unless we send the project to the Government of India at once, it will take long time to start the work. If I wait till March, that means that one other year is gone."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I congratulate the hon. the Law Member on the great expedition with which he wants to carry out this project. But even he must know that these projects do take some time."

The RAJA OF RAMNAD:—"May I just say that in answer to a supplementary question, the hon. the Law Member said that to push on this Mettur project, the contemplated Irrigation Law would be necessary? Am I to understand that the hon. the Law Member expects the Irrigation Law to be passed and to be in perfect working order before February next?"

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I am in full confidence that the Irrigation Law would be passed soon."

14th December 1923]

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I now see that difficulties are increasing. If hon. Members look at paragraph 2 of the Memorandum they will find that—

‘ the project has hitherto been held up owing to certain points of dispute between the Madras Government and the Mysore State ; a final settlement is now in sight.’

A very delightful and diplomatic statement. What he says is this : Between the Mysore State and the Madras Government there has been a dispute which has gone on for years and has taxed the patience of eminent men. . . .”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ I do wish that discussions of this kind which may hinder these negotiations are not inaugurated.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ It is not a point of order, Sir.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ I submit that I only appeal to the good sense of hon. Members not to enter into discussions of this sort. I also appeal to the good sense of the hon. Member for the University and I hope my appeal will be responded to.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I do not understand this, Sir. I do not want that the Madras Government should get anything by favour from any other Government. I stand here representing the people of this Presidency just as much as any other Member in this House and to say that we ought not to discuss about certain things lest something might happen is a thing which I cannot understand. But I only want to ask this question, whether the hon. Member can give confident assurance to this House that before January or February next he is going to have the scheme put into operation.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ It might happen to-day.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ It might not happen for another year.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ If speeches of this kind are made, it might not.”

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member (Mr. Satyamurti) may take the assurance of the hon. Member in charge of the Department. He might be able to do it with an amount of expedition. Why should the hon. Member question the capacity or the willingness of the hon. the Law Member ?”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ I have never taken assurances from the Madras Government and I do not propose to begin now. I was asking this House to consider whether it accepts that this money should be spent now and should not be sanctioned in March or April next when the budget time comes.

“ I then come to Sangameswaram project. There we are told that—

‘ The Consulting Engineer to the Government of India, whose opinion was invited on the above proposal, has advised that the detailed investigation should not be taken up before the nature and extent of the rock across the river at Sangameswaram as well as the extent of land submerged at the full reservoir level in the Hyderabad State have been investigated in the first instance. With this end in view, the permission of His Exalted Highness the Nizam to carry out the necessary surveys in the Hyderabad State has been applied for.’

Therefore, the preliminary investigations cost all this. Thus it seems to me that here again we have got an element of uncertainty and I do not think anything will be lost by the hon. the Law Member waiting till the next budget time comes and putting forward these estimates as part of the usual grants made at that time of the year, instead of trying to rush these grants

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[14th December 1923]

through just now by using extraordinary provisions which, he is no doubt entitled to, but I do not think, are consistent with the development of the full financial control of this House."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"May I rise to a point of order, Sir? Mr. Sriman Biswanath Das and myself have given notice of Motions with regard to this grant and it has been the practice of this House to take up such Motions first and then go on with the general discussion. But a general discussion is going on now and the Motions have not been taken up. I think that, according to the practice already adopted by this House, these Motions, notice of which has been given, should be taken up first."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"They will be taken up soon. We are now having discussion on the main question."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"I want to know, Mr. Deputy President, whether you have overruled my point."

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"I have overruled you and I am asking the other hon. Member to proceed."

12 noon. Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I regret that in dealing with a Motion of this description, I have to take a different course of action than that of the hon. the Member for the University. I believe it is a long-standing complaint that the Government have not been pushing through the various irrigation projects which are under their contemplation with that promptitude and care which we would desire. And when now this proposal has been made for the purpose of pushing through the Irrigation projects, I think it is our duty rather to further the rapid investigation and execution of these projects than to place any obstacles on the way of pushing those schemes. It is from this standpoint that I approach this question. Though the Cauvery-Mettur project has hitherto been held up owing to a dispute between the Madras Government and the Mysore Government, the hon. the Law Member has been good enough to tell us that an amicable settlement will be made as early as possible, and may we hope that it will not be long delayed? We find an account that, in the case of the prosecution of the Sangameswaram project, it is necessary to carry on the investigations with the help of His Exalted Highness the Nizam's Government, and let us hope that attempts made in that direction will also be successful. Sir, if I have risen to offer some remarks on this Motion, it is because I feel that further information is necessary regarding the possibilities of the Sangameswaram project which is one of the items which have been referred to by the hon. the Law Member. Mr. Morgan's report does not give any detailed information regarding the Sangameswaram project. Having carefully gone through that project I find the scheme suggested by him . . ."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—"I desire to make a statement. I realize that it is to a certain extent a new project, and I propose to place on the table of the House a full account of the project. It will serve one or two more districts than those that are found here."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"I am glad to hear from the hon. the Law Member that he will shortly place before us further information regarding this. But before we are called upon to vote for this Motion, may I not expect him to give us more information than the meagre one furnished in this note? For, we believe from the remarks made by him that all points within those proposals are embodied in certain other schemes

14th December 1923] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

referred to by Mr. Morgan. We find from Mr. Morgan's report that the Tungabhadra project, which is intended to serve a number of districts, has been shelved. I wish to know whether the Sangameswaram project is intended to cover the scope of the portions of the scheme of the Tungabhadra project which has been investigated by the Irrigation Commission regarding the construction of a reservoir in the river Kistna, and whether it embodies in its scope portions of these two schemes. I am not in a position to understand this. Though the hon. the Law Member may take some time to have all these proposals matured so as to place them before this House, may I not ask him on this point, when asking for a grant, of investigation of a scheme to give us what further information he has at his disposal regarding the Sangameswaram project? The details given are so meagre that I am constrained to ask for this information."

The hon. the Deputy President then called upon Mr. Biswanath Das to move his Amendment.

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Sir, I beg to move—

That the sum, Rs. 28,755, be reduced by Rs. 100.

" Sir, I do not mean to join in the discussion that has been going on regarding the Grant. I only want some information regarding the Ganosala project that is to be started in the Ganjam district. I request the hon. Member for Irrigation just to inform us the stage in which this project stands. At the time of the last Budget, the hon. Member for Irrigation was pleased to inform us that he awaited the sanction of the Government and as soon as he got it, it would be put into execution. I therefore request him to make a statement on the subject, so that we shall be in a position to know when we are to have that work started."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" In the Appendix to the Demands we find a short description of the Sangameswaram project. From this it is clear that about 17 lakhs of acres are to be irrigated when this scheme matures. According to the description given in Mr. Morgan's report on page 12 regarding the Kistna Reservoir project, we understand it is to irrigate about 7 lakhs and odd acres. First of all, I wish to know whether both these schemes will be executed separately, or whether the execution of the Sangameswaram project will make it unnecessary to construct the Kistna Reservoir project. If we are to go into the details of the areas that are to be benefited, as far as the Kistna district is concerned, I do not think that the Sangameswaram project will be very beneficial. We know that under the Kistna Anicut system there are 8 lakhs and odd acres being irrigated, besides the Divi project which irrigates more than 60,000 acres. By constructing a reservoir higher up at Sangameswaram, what would be its effect upon the irrigation of the Kistna Anicut system as well as the Divi pumping system is a matter which should be made well known to the public. In this case, as in the case of the Metur project, I suspect there is some difficulty because of their being situated in the Indian States. I know when the Metur project was begun to be investigated and when so long ago as 1910 the Madras Government was getting estimates prepared and revised, the Mysore Darbar had finished its Kannambadi project and set the whole scheme in working order; and just like that, even in the case of useful and prosperous projects like the Sangameswaram project, there may be every possibility of the advantage being reaped by the Indian States. I do not agree with the hon. Members, Mr. Satyamurti and others, who say that this

[Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju] [14th December 1923]

expenditure is unnecessary because, having had the experience of the Metur project, one would be anxious to push through every scheme, more especially those projects connected with Indian States. We want every scheme to be completed. After all, it is only continuing the services of an Engineer who has great experience in irrigation. I had a few hours conversation with Mr. Ramalinga Ayyar and I am sure that that gentleman will make any one understand the various technicalities of these projects, and the lucidity with which he is able to explain matters will make even a lay man appreciate the usefulness of the continuance of his services to the State."

12-15 p.m. Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"Mr. President, Sir, if the hon. Member, Mr. Satyamurti, will not take an assurance from Government Members, I hope he will have no objection to take an assurance from me, a Member like himself on this side of the House. On this question of the Metur project, I have had occasion to converse not only with Mr. Ramalinga Ayyar, but also with the hon. Member for Irrigation when this question came up for consideration in the Finance Committee. I was at first somewhat sceptic as to the usefulness or necessity for the provision now asked for. But on going through every detail, the Finance Committee was satisfied that it was a very useful and necessary provision, and an urgent one too. In the first place, the Metur project has been so far advanced that it only requires revision in some essential particulars and technical details which only an experienced officer will be able to make at the present moment; and, secondly, as the Government assured us that there will be a settlement of the dispute between this Government and the Government of Mysore at a very early date, we, the Members of the Finance Committee, thought that in the interests of the people of this Presidency, an irrigation project like this should be pushed on with as much speed as possible. It is with this object in view that we thought it necessary that Mr. Ramalinga Ayyar's services should be requisitioned for the purpose.

"Similarly, with reference to the Sangameswaram project, it is necessary to find out whether the bed of the river is able to bear the foundation necessary for the contemplated big reservoir. For that, I think, Sir, an ordinary officer like an Executive Engineer or an Assistant Engineer will not do. We want an efficient, experienced and expert officer like Mr. Ramalinga Ayyar for the purpose. That was one of the chief points put before us and, in addition to that, the question was how much land was necessary to be submerged in the Nizam's State in order to have a good reservoir. The soil had to be tested and it was also necessary to ascertain the amount that would be required for acquiring lands for the purpose. These two things cannot be done by an ordinary engineer. These were the points that were specially brought to our notice by the hon. Mr. Ramaswami Ayyar and we were satisfied that this appointment was necessary and that this Grant ought to be moved. I therefore think that under these circumstances my hon. Friend for the University will kindly take the assurance from me and vote for this Grant."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Mr. President, I rise to associate myself with the views expressed by the three last speakers and congratulate the hon. Member for Irrigation for the expedition with which he has pushed forward two of the schemes that have been waiting for years and years in this Presidency. It seems to be a matter of happy augury that just as we are discussing the matter a despatch has been received from the Govern-

14th December 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

ment of Mysore. I hope the matter has been more or less settled by means of this despatch. Sir, we did not expect that the Metur project would come to the stage of being started so soon as this. We in the Coimbatore district expect that an opportunity will be given to raise the question whether at least some of the water that will be stored in the Metur reservoir will not be made available for the Coimbatore district. I believe, Sir, at one time there was a proposal to run a channel from the right bank of the reservoir into the Coimbatore district and irrigate some of the lands there. I believe the possibility of doing it has not been completely investigated or decided in any way finally. Now that the matter has come to a head, I request the hon. Member for Irrigation to consider this question also and see whether a portion of the water that is going to be stored at Metur cannot be made available for Coimbatore. By doing that there will be a double advantage. The Coimbatore district is a dry district and its inhabitants are sometimes very near famine. For instance, in the current year there has been no rain and in several portions of the district, the condition is very grave indeed. Cattle are being sold for a third of their purchase value. If a portion of the Coimbatore district can be irrigated with the water stored in the Metur reservoir, this state of things can be improved. If water is taken to Coimbatore, the same water can be utilized for half the acreage below the district, that is to say, the water that will be available for irrigating 50,000 acres in the Tanjore district can be made available for irrigating 50,000 acres in Coimbatore district and another 25,000 acres in Tanjore. So, in that way there will be a double advantage. The only thing we have to consider in this case is whether it will be possible to run a channel from the right bank of the Metur reservoir. So far as I have been able to make out, and so far as I have been able to consult the engineering opinion that was available, I understand that it is possible. So I earnestly request the hon. the Member for Irrigation to bear this in mind and have an investigation made as to the feasibility of this scheme. As I said already, these two schemes are big schemes and the sooner we bring them to a head and start them, the better for our Presidency. Therefore, we have really to be thankful to the hon. the Irrigation Member and not find fault with him for having come to a decision and started the schemes. With these words I very gladly support the main Motion."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Sir, in replying to the observations which fell from some of my hon Friends, will they permit me to thank them for their very helpful remarks, which will certainly be carefully borne in mind? Let me, in the first place, tell the hon. Member from Ganjam something with regard to the Girisola project. Sir, with regard to this the survey is complete. Earth-work has been ordered to be started and by the time we meet for the Budget, a very great deal of progress will, I am confident, have been made with regard to it.

" I shall next turn to Coimbatore. With regard to that, it is doubtless possible that by a system of channels that district may perhaps be benefited by the Metur reservoir. But it is too soon to say what exactly is going to happen. It will depend very much upon the amount of money we are able to get from the Government of India and the way in which we are able to fashion our reservoir and our channels. If our estimates are sanctioned in their entirety, I believe the reservoir may have enough storage to permit of that. I do not desire to give this as an assurance, but I am only mentioning it as a possibility.

13th December 1923] [Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo]

possible. Three years have already passed, and I should like to know what progress we have made. We have done very little and our pace is very slow.

"Then, Sir, if you will look into the newspapers you will see that most of the presidents of district boards—it may be in their private capacity—acted as agents to the parties, and some of them acted as agents to the Ministry here that stood as candidates in their respective districts."

Diwan Bahadur P. KESAVA PILLAI:—"I rise to a point of order. Nearly a dozen Members have spoken like this. I for one deny that I ever acted as agent to the Ministry. It is rather a vilification."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS MAHASAYO:—"I know that. I say that from personal knowledge. I speak of my district, and I apologize if he takes it amiss. I say I have got everything on record. I do not speak anything which I cannot prove."

"This being so, Sir, I think the Resolution does not go very far. The presidentships of district boards should be absolutely left open for election. If my Mussalman friends do think that they do not find places in them, I think as private individuals we shall appeal to the gentlemen belonging to other castes in those districts whether they cannot help the former. I think that would be the best guarantee that they can ever have, or if they want to press any Amendment I for one have no objection. I do not think there will be many in this House who will take objection to that course. Anyway our belief is very strong on the point that we do not go further. With these few words, I support the Resolution."

Mr. T. ADINARAYANA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, every Member of this House knows that things are not satisfactory in this department. In the first place, we heard that only 6 out of 25 district boards at present enjoy the privilege of electing their presidents. If the hon. the Chief Minister does not seem to be proud of this state of affairs, I need not offer any remarks about it. That the hon. the Chief Minister has conceded that wherever two-thirds of the members of a district board ask for the election of president the elective franchise will be given, is not encouraging. Whether two-thirds of the members ask for it or not, we must insist upon the franchise being given. We know that the concession which he yields is nothing, because it is common knowledge that during the last three years in which he has been in charge of the Local Self-Government portfolio, the composition of the district board, especially the nominated portion, does not represent the views of the majority of the people."

"Mr. President, one of the reasons, not convincing, but all the same adduced by the hon. the Chief Minister, as to why he could not throw open district board presidentships for election was that their finances were bad. Sir, may I ask, what guarantee is there that this financial stringency will not be perpetual and that nominations will not be allowed to go on? I wish also to point out to the hon. the Chief Minister that the aim of all good administration must be not only good, but such as will convince the world that it is good. My previous speaker said that there is a good deal of suspicion regarding nominations. It is true to say, if I am not mistaken, that the gift of nomination has been misused in this particular department, and that suspicion appears to be not altogether groundless when inefficient people were nominated while really better and capable men were available. This

14th December 1923]

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Where are the words 'for the relief of' etc.?"

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Sir, the Grant is for the relief of the sufferers in Ganjām and Vizagapatam districts. In the explanatory Memorandum which is given by the hon. the Finance Member at page 7, these words occur."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, my point of order is this, and I crave your ruling on it. Under section 72-D of the Government of India Act, sub-clause (2) (c)—

'No proposal for the appropriation of any such revenues or moneys for any purpose shall be made except on the recommendation of the Governor, communicated to the Council.'

"Sir, my submission is that no recommendation of the Governor in regard to this grant has been communicated to the Council as provided for by Standing Order No. 69."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Sir, exactly the same objection was raised on another Grant before you, Mr. President, came and took your seat."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I do not want to answer that. Standing Order No. 69 reads 'Communications from the Governor to the Council are made—

(1) by a speech; and (2) by a written message'.

"You will notice, Sir, that the word 'communication' is used both in the Government of India Act and in the Standing Orders providing that the only two ways by which communications could be made by the Governor to the Council are either by a speech or a written message. I submit, Sir, with some confidence and in all humility that that speech or that message could be only by His Excellency Lord Willingdon and not by anybody on his behalf, not by any officer designated in his name and in his official capacity. The statutory provisions or the Standing Orders of this House provide the manner in which that communication should take place. I submit that in the absence of that speech or written message it must be presumed that there is no message which this Council, as a Council, can take cognisance of. The hon. the Law Member, in answer to my objection earlier to-day, said:—"I from my place in this House give you this message from the Governor that he has recommended'."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I did not."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I stand corrected. Therefore the position is much easier. I rose on a point of order on an earlier Motion and I submit that this is a fresh Motion on which I am entitled to raise a fresh point of order. I crave your decision on the Act and on the Standing Orders as they stand."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I am not entitled to address the Chair, but with your permission, Sir, I hope to be allowed to make a few remarks. There is a somewhat familiar doctrine of law known as *res judicata* by which if a case has been decided on certain issues, the same issues are not allowed to be raised again in another case."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I take it that it is in another case and between the same parties."

[14th December 1923]

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" I stand corrected by the hon. the President and the analogy is complete. The case, such as it was, was this point of order. It rose on another ground and the parties were the same. The learned and the eloquent Member for the University, fresh from the study of the Standing Orders, was the plaintiff. I was the defendant, and the issue was decided by the hon. the Deputy President, who gave his ruling on that matter. I submit that that principle is one of wide and indeed of universal application. I do not rest content with that. I shall, with your leave, address myself to the particular subject.

"Turning now to the Government of India Act, it says that—

No proposal for the appropriation of any such revenues or other moneys for any purpose shall be made except on the recommendation of the Governor, communicated to the Council.

"The recommendation is communicated through the hon. Member in charge of this Motion whether he is Minister or Member. The recommendation is now before the House. It is well known to a President like you, Sir, versed in precedents, that during the lifetime of the last Council, this recommendation has been conveyed by the responsible Member or Minister in charge. I desire to indicate just now that it is such a recommendation that is before the House. The word 'communicated' in the Government of India Act (page 53) is used not in the sense of the word 'communication' used in the Standing Orders, but in the sense of things passing from one to another, just as I communicate my words to you. It is the recommendation to be communicated. So long as there is no rule laying down that the communication under this section shall be in one way or the other, it may be done in any of the recognized ways. Turning now to the Standing Orders the word 'communication' is used in a general manner. It is a technical expression and has no special advertence to the word 'communicated' in section 72-D as having reference to certain types of communication from the Governor to the Council and *vice versa*. I submit therefore we should reconcile these two enactments, and it ought to be done especially having regard to the precedent in the matter. I say there is nothing of substance in this point of order apart from the contention that I venture to urge, that the principle which I have been enunciating is one of wide and important application."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The words used are 'except with the recommendation of the Governor communicated to the Council'. Your contention is that the Governor can make no communication except in writing or by a message sent to the President. Is that not so? "

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" My contention is that communications can take place either by a speech or by a written message. And if I may add, on the question of precedent, it was only the other day we had the pleasure of listening to a message from His Excellency the Governor regarding the Religious Endowments Bill which you read to this House, and I believe it was signed by His Excellency Lord Willingdon. I therefore submit that the word 'communication' is a well-known English word used in the Act and in the Standing Orders and the framers of the Standing Orders must have had the Government of India Act in their minds. And after all, the question of *res judicata* does not arise, because I am not a party to this dispute at all. It is not a private dispute. I am only speaking of the privileges of this

14th December 1923]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

House. It is by mere accident that I am raising this point of order. Therefore I submit that it is up to this House that such important communications or recommendations should not be taken unless there is something to show that it has been recommended. At present there is only the statement made *ex cathedra* by the hon. the Mover of the Motion. And I submit therefore that the point of order does arise."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"For the last three years we have been passing a number of supplementary grants. Even the Budget, I think, never came with such a formal communication. The point now raised is very interesting. I will reserve it for careful consideration; in the meantime we will proceed with this grant."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Sir, may I make one suggestion? I suggest that this Motion might be allowed to lie over, till the point is considered."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I would like to consider the question in all its bearings, but it must be noted that for the last three years, before we had the pleasure of having Mr. Satyamurti in our midst, we have been allowing a number of grants which have come down to us, generally taking the hon. the Finance Member's statement as equal to the communication from the Governor. That has been the practice of this House. Of course the hon. Member is not bound by it. But the other hon. Members who sat in the last Council with me are expected to understand that practice. They cannot easily go back upon it. That being so, before I begin to express an opinion upon it, as it were casting a doubt upon everything we have done for the past three years, I will consider the matter very carefully. Probably, in all these cases the Governor might have permitted those things."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"Most certainly, Sir."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It may not be difficult for us to get a few lines in writing from the Governor saying that all those Grants which have been put forward have been allowed by him to go forward. I do not think we will be justified in stopping the work from going on."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"This paper has been forwarded, as it is stated at the top of the schedule, on the recommendation of His Excellency the Governor. The paper was submitted to him before it is laid on the table of the House."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"What Mr. Satyamurti contends is that it is an unsigned document and that he would not be content with it. He wants something signed by the Governor. That is the point which I wish to consider carefully."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"The Standing Order wants it, Sir. Another point of order, Sir, on which I want your ruling, which according to the hon. the Law Member is *res judicata*, is this: Under the Government of India Act there is only one provision under which proposals for Grants can come before this House. According to section 72-D, clause (2), proposals of the Local Government for the appropriation of provincial revenues and other moneys in any year shall be submitted to the vote of the House in the form of demands for grants. That provision alone governs the procedure for proposals for grants being placed before the House. Turning now to the Legislative Council Rules, Rule 32 says:

'That an estimate shall be presented to the Council for a supplementary or additional grant (1) when the amount voted in the budget of a grant is found to be insufficient for the purposes

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[14th December 1923]

of current year, or (2) a need arises during the current year for expenditure for which the vote of the Council is necessary upon some new service not contemplated in the budget for that year.'

"Only under these two contingencies the Rules contemplate a supplementary or additional grant. You will find Order of the day No. II reading thus:—'Motions for reappropriation for 1923-24'. If you will read the Motion before the House 'that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 1 lakh to be provided from savings under Civil Works—'Transferred' it does not purport to be a demand for additional or supplementary grant as it has been described. But it is a motion for reappropriation from one head to another. The amount has been sanctioned for another purpose. On that matter Rule 34 of the Legislative Council Rules defines the functions of the Public Accounts Committee.

'It shall be the duty of the Committee to bring to the notice of the Council every reappropriation from one grant to another grant.'

"It contemplates the previous reappropriation by some agency, certainly not this Council, from one grant to another grant, being reported to this Council by the Committee of Public Accounts. If you will kindly turn to the paper the hon. the Finance Member very kindly circulated to this House a few days ago explaining the procedure underlying this motion, it says:

'It seems to be preferable to reappropriate from the savings that have been made to cover the new expenditure that is now necessary. Consequently the motions that are now tabled are motions to meet new demands by reappropriation from sums resumed under existing heads of the budget.'

"Towards the close of the first paragraph of the Memorandum he says: 12-45 p.m. 'Under the rule 34 (2) (i) of the Legislative Council Rules, the Legislative Council can transfer funds from one grant to another'. I submit, Sir, there is no such power vested in this Council. We can only discuss either a proposal for a grant for the first time coming at the budget time, or a proposal for a supplementary or additional grant. Although the Government benches may give reasons for incurring this expenditure under the Transferred head, it cannot be put as part of the Motion, the Motion itself being converted from a motion for an additional or supplementary grant to a motion for reappropriation from one grant to another. It is not a mere technical point, Mr. President, for I think it goes against the fundamental principles of finance, viz., that lapsed grants must be taken over to next year and not reappropriated in this haphazard fashion at the end of the financial year. That is why, Sir, I am raising this point of order. I request you, Mr. President, not to treat it as a merely technical matter, which I am sure you would not, but as one raising an issue of some financial importance in regard to our Budget and the supplementary grants."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"Do I understand the hon. Member to say that the Government could go on spending the money without our sanction? That is what it comes to. The point of order is that this Motion of the hon. the Law Member is out of order because the Government do not ask for money for the first time, for a fresh grant, but only ask for lapsed money from savings effected."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"Not at all, Sir. The point that I raised was that the Motion up to the third line that is now being discussed, is entirely in order because this House has got the right to discuss it. But, Sir, the point is, the words 'to be provided from savings under 'Grant

14th December 1923]

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

XXVIII. Civil Works—Transferred' appearing at the end of the Motion on which the hon. Member has said that it is a mere surplusage, are not to occur, for the proposition with these words would be out of order. This House ought not to be committed by such a demand to a reappropriation of one grant to another, the responsibility for which the executive must take. According to the Act, the Public Accounts Committee must scrutinize and report to this House of such cases. I am not suggesting that they can spend money without our control. Nothing is farther from my mind, for I am anxious to increase the control of this House. I am only suggesting that while asking for a supplementary grant, they ought not to get our implied or express sanction for reappropriation of one grant to another which ought to be discussed on its own merits as to whether that expenditure has been properly effected and has resulted in a saving or whether the saving is just or has been arrived at by starving some items of the grant. That discussion would come before the Public Accounts Committee and not before us."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"This question, I am afraid, affects the procedure which we have been regularly following for three years."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I am very sorry for it."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I know that Mr. Satyamurti is very sorry."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I beg your pardon, Sir. I did not mean any bitterness or contempt. I was sorry for raising it for the first time now."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I do not think any hon. Member has reason to feel sorry for raising a point of order, for it is by such points of order being raised that our procedure can be regularized. But I should mention that this point really affects the course which we have been following for some time. I would rather adjourn this also for further consideration and allow all these Motions to be disposed of. If I think that the procedure should be in any way altered, I shall tell the Government to do so. I am much obliged to the hon. Member for raising it."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—"I thank you, Sir."

The hon. Mr C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Sir, I take it now that I am not asked to say anything with regard to the point of order now raised. I shall reserve my remarks till the occasion comes."

"This Motion, as hon. Members will perceive, is one necessitated by the recent and devastating cyclone in the districts of Ganjam and Vizagapatam and it is for the relief of the sufferers. It is impossible now, owing to the paucity of information available from the areas affected, to find out under what heading the relief should be given. I am not going to say more about it in detail at present, because I notice on the agenda paper an amendment very legitimately inserted at the instance of Mr. Narasimharaju, raising a discussion regarding the scope of relief to be afforded. No one will be more glad than the Government to get suggestions from hon. Members as to the proper and legitimate scope of the relief. But all that I have to say by way of prefatory remarks is this, namely, that at the present stage it is not possible to say that one lakh of rupees would be utilized in one form or another, in building houses or repairing irrigation works, or in affording money doles to sufferers. But as the pressure is urgent, and the

[Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar] [14th December 1923]

relief has to be extended almost immediately, it is feared that this one lakh is but the beginning of a series of Grants which the Government will have to ask for in order to adequately and properly relieve the distress which is unprecedented and distressing beyond measure. At the present moment we come before the Council asking for a lakh of rupees and trust that, after the Council has made its views perfectly apparent as to the direction which the relief measures should take, they will grant us further sums."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"Mr. President, Sir, the very fact that His Excellency has referred to the distress in Ganjām and Vizagapatam districts in his opening address to this Council does place the people of these two districts under obligation to the Government for the sympathy that is expressed in this distress. We know that early steps are being taken by the Government to afford relief to the distressed in these districts. When I tabled this motion for knowing the scope of the relief to be afforded to the poor sufferers, my main object was to induce the Government to widen the scope more than what it may be under the short note published as an appendix to the demand. It has been suggested that bamboo and timber will be given freely to the sufferers. As far as the town of Vizagapatam is concerned, it is not only the mud or thatched houses that suffered, but there are some quarters in the town which are inhabited by very poor people who once occupied a very rich position. For instance, the so-called Fort of Vizagapatam which is occupied by Muhammadan population, once very prosperous but now under adverse circumstances, is reduced to utter poverty. They live in tiled houses. From my personal experience, I can say that every one of these houses did suffer serious loss and unless relief is afforded to the poor inhabitants in that portion of the town, I am afraid that their houses cannot be rebuilt. Even now, some of the inhabitants are living in portions of public buildings such as the Kurupam market, and other places. That is one of the reasons that I urge in support of this motion.

"Then, Sir, we know that the first monsoon has completely failed in the Vizagapatam district and on account of the early rains in September, some crops were sowed throughout the district. But the two heavy rains, one about the 30th of October and the other, the cyclonic weather about the 17th of November, did great havoc to the district. All the standing crops are expected to yield very poor returns, and the distress in the district on this ground is very great.

"Sir, I want to make one other appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member in this connexion. The kists are to be collected in the months of January and later. As far as the wet lands are concerned, I mean the irrigated wet lands, there is no question about the collection of kists. I do not think that it will give any trouble. But the real difficulty is about the assessment on dry lands. The existing practice and the Standing Orders of the Board of Revenue do allow the grant of remission on dry lands in cases of distress like this. This is a matter for special consideration by the Revenue authorities. In this connexion, I wish also to state that whenever the first monsoon fails it is a matter of practice that even the irrigated lands are cultivated with dry crops, and whether they yield a crop or not, generally dry assessment is levied on them. But this year this must require a careful examination and in all cases where even the dry crops failed on account of the heavy rain, the Government should

14th December 1923] [Mr. C. V. S. Narasimha Raju]

see their way to grant remission. I may bring to your notice, Sir, that the irrigated lands are generally cultivated with cholam when the first monsoon fails. In this year, most of these lands were cultivated with cholam as a dry crop in the irrigated lands. But on account of the two heavy rains which I have already mentioned, the crops did fail and the ryots do deserve remission of dry assessment even on the wet lands that were cultivated with dry crops. I have, then, Sir, to bring to the notice of the hon. the Chief Minister, the Minister for Local Self-Government, that he should show some sympathy towards the municipalities. I cannot now mention the extent of the damage that is done to the roads of the district board. As a matter of fact, it is the duty of the Government, as far as the trunk roads are concerned, to restore them to a good condition. As far as the district board is concerned, the Government are not justified in expecting the district board to spend a single pie of its own in restoring the trunk roads. As far as the second-class roads are concerned, they are also breached in many places and the breaches are such that it is necessary that the district board should take up the construction of culverts for the passage of surplus water in future. The abnormal rainfall of this year may be taken as the standard for the future and the excess rainfall over the normal should be provided for and necessary culverts should be constructed. Even in this case the hon. the Chief Minister may examine the question and induce the Government to afford extra contribution towards the second-class roads. I do not think that that claim is an extravagant one and I believe the Local Self-Government Ministry will find its way to lay down certain principles of relief in this line. I only invoke the precedent of Malabar and I believe the Government have established some precedents as to the nature of reliefs that ought to be afforded in special cases like this. They may adopt the same lines of relief in the case of this district board also."

(At this stage the hon. the Deputy President took the chair.)

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Mr. Deputy President, Sir, we are sorry we have approached the House with Motions for reduction when we ought to ask for more. It is a pity that under the Government of India Act, the Council has not got the power to enhance the grant. It is therefore our bounden duty to impress on the Government the necessity of more grants in view of the history of woes and sufferings of the people of Ganjām and Vizagapatam, sufferings and woes which they have never seen for probably 50 or even 100 years before."

Mr. YAHYA ALI SAHIB Bahadur :—" May I ask, Sir, if the House will not be adjourned as usual at 1 O'clock to enable the Muhammadan members to attend to their prayers?"

1 p.m.

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—" Let this be finished."

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—" Sir, without engaging the time of the Council any more, I may request the hon. the Law Member just to allow me to make some personal representations. I am also told that the hon. the Minister for Education is going to visit these tracts . . ."

Mr. A. V. BHANOJI RAO :—" Mr. Deputy President, Sir, I do not want to take up the time of the House very long, and I shall finish in a few minutes. In supporting this motion, I wish to thank the Government for the relief that was given to Vizagapatam. I represent the Vizagapatam

[Mr. A. V. Bhanoji Rao]

[14th December 1923]

urban constituency, and as you all know what the cyclone has done for the Vizagapatam city, I need not say much to you on that matter. The cyclone is quite unprecedented in the annals of at least the Vizagapatam district. I thank the Government for the relief they have so far given, but at the same time I do not think it is adequate, if that represents the whole grant that is going to be made by Government. In this connexion I must also say that the District Collector and all the officials of the municipality of Vizagapatam have done their best to relieve the sufferings of the people. I would request, at least on behalf of Vizagapatam city, that the hon. the Chief Minister would kindly take the trouble of coming over to Vizagapatam to see the damage done to the municipality itself. Once more thanking the Government for the relief already given, I support this motion, with the hope that another adequate sum may be allotted for the relief of Vizagapatam city."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"Mr. Deputy President, Sir, I do not want to prolong the discussion. I have heard with very great interest the remarks that fell from my hon. Friends. As to the suggestions that have been made by my hon. Friend, Mr. Narasimharaju, I may say that Mr. Macmichael is touring in the locality just now, and his observations will at once be communicated to him for such action as he may take which he will report to us.

"With regard to the amount, it is recognized by the Government that one lakh will not be sufficient, and in all probability we shall have to come before the Council for larger sums and I take it that the Council will be as ready to vote for larger sums in this cause as they have been in regard to this Motion."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"May I respectfully suggest to you, Sir, that the debate may be put off until after lunch, as all the Muhammadan Members have gone out of their seats?"

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT:—"I wanted to know if it is the practice to adjourn for lunch at 1 O'clock on Fridays, but I find it is not. This is what the hon. the President said on the subject on 2nd September 1921 :

"Before we proceed to the other items of business, I should like to inform the House that the House will adjourn for lunch to-day (Friday), and on all subsequent Fridays when the Council is sitting at 1-30 p.m., and re-assemble at 2-30 p.m., the additional half an hour being given to suit the convenience of our Muhammadan Colleagues of this House, and I am sure I carry the House with me in deciding to this effect."

"This was put before the House and the House consented to this arrangement. In those days the House used to adjourn at 2 and re-assemble at 2-30 p.m. As we are now adjourning at 1-30 p.m., I do not think the request for adjournment at 1 O'clock ought to be persisted in. So the House will now proceed with the discussion."

Mr. G. RAMESWARA RAO:—"May I, with your permission, Sir, put one question to the hon. the Law Member? It is whether he proposes not to forget the claims of Bellary and Anantapur districts for remission, as they are famine-affected districts."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—"I think, Sir, it does not really arise out of this Motion. As soon as the Government finds the relief necessary, it will certainly give it."

14th December 1923]

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ Are there recent floods in Bellary and Anantapur, Sir? For, he is asking for relief under this grant which is only for relief from floods.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ He asks for relief on the ground that Bellary and Anantapur are famine affected.”

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo :—“ May I ask one question, Sir? It is whether the hon. the Law Member will be pleased to furnish the reports submitted by the various officers of Government to the Members of this House for their information.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ In all probability all those reports will be placed on the table of the House, but I cannot give any definite information. I may say that a number of reports have been published already.”

The Amendment of Mr. Biswanath Das was, with the leave of the House, withdrawn, as also the Amendment of Mr. Narasimharaju.

The Motion was then put to the House and carried and the Grant was made.

Grant X.

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—“ Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 7,750 under “ General Administration—Reserved ”—to be provided from savings under Grant VIII—General Administration—Reserved.

“ Sir, as will be observed from the explanatory Memorandum furnished by the hon. the Finance Member, this represents the travelling expenses incurred by the Members of the Irrigation Committee, and the Memorandum itself gives in fairly full detail the circumstances under which this Committee has been appointed. There is only one word which I wish to add. In the course of the labours of this Committee it has been discovered that it is possible to meet many objections to the Bill. It differs in many points from the old Bill, and differs, if I may say so at this premature stage, in the direction of easing the situation and rendering more clear the rights of the various proprietors, zamindars and the ryots. Those departures have been initiated, and many of the suggestions have been accepted. On receipt of the Government of India's sanction, the Bill is expected to be introduced in January. But for the labours of this Committee, the atmosphere which prevailed at the introduction of the original Irrigation Bill—for there was a certain amount of distrust and suspicion—would not have been dissipated, as I think it has been. I think there can be no two opinions as to the usefulness of this Committee, or the necessity for its formation.”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—“ Sir, I rise to oppose this Motion not on any merits of the Irrigation Bill, past, present or future, and I do not want to be understood to say anything with regard to the merits of the Bill as it may come before this House. I have very strong opinions on that and probably it may be that the Bill meets many of the points which I have in my mind. But what I want to draw the attention of this House to is the very extraordinary procedure which the Government seem to have adopted in this matter. Here is a Bill introduced before this House; this

[Mr. S. Satyamurti]

[14th December 1923]

House summarily rejects it. Without therefore taking upon themselves the responsibility of reconsidering the Bill in the light of the criticisms offered in this Council or elsewhere, they go and appoint a Committee and ask this Council to sanction expenditure incurred for the further consideration of a Bill which they did not want and thereby limit the scope of its discussion in this Council. I dare say there are some Members of the Council here who sat on that Committee, and I have no doubt in my mind that they will bring a fresh mind to bear on the question when it comes before this House again. But I think it is somewhat of a handicap that before the main principles of the Bill have been discussed on the floor of the House and before the House has either accepted or rejected them, Members of this House should have been placed in the false position of having committed themselves more or less to the main provisions of the Bill, thereby truncating the freedom they would otherwise have in taking part in the discussion. And it seems to me somewhat wanting in the courtesy and the respect due to this Council that it should be asked to vote money for a Committee to consider a Bill which it did not want. I am not considering the basic principles of the Bill. It may be that the Bill is most beneficial. It may be that the acres which are now dry may become wet, or where one blade now grows two may grow hereafter. But all these facts, good facts, cannot materially alter the situation as I see. Here is a Bill which comes before the House, and the House says 'We do not want it'. And the Government calls some of us and appoints a Committee and pays travelling allowance. They discuss the Bill, and they may come and say here 'Here is a Bill which some of your Members have considered' and throw it at your face. I do not think that it is a proper procedure to sanction. To raise that constitutional point, Sir, I formally object to this grant and, in doing so, I do not want to be understood as committing myself to any opinion with regard to the merits or demerits of the Irrigation Bill or the labours of this Committee. But I only raise this constitutional issue."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR: — "Sir, I frankly own to a feeling of intense surprise that an aspersion has been cast upon the Members of this House, which, I take it, they will resent as they ought to. It is suggested that because Members of this House took part in the discussion of another Irrigation Bill, and they have been called upon to perform their function of advising the Government and have been called upon to help in the solution of a very difficult and tangled problem and to make suggestions to the Government for fashioning a new Irrigation Bill, they will not bring a fresh mind to bear upon it, and they are lost to their sense of responsibility, that they will forget, because there is this travelling allowance of Rs. 7,750, the elementary right which they have and the duty they owe to themselves and to their constituencies"

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI: — "On a point of personal explanation, Sir, may I respectfully suggest to the hon. the Law Member that next time he wants to answer me, he listens to my speech before he answers? I did not suggest that they would not bring a fresh mind to bear on the Bill. I said they would bring a fresh mind to bear upon the question, and secondly I only said this: that it is placing them in a false position to get them committed to the provisions of the Bill and then come to this House and so on. And I stand by that statement."

14th December 1923]

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“Well, Sir, that statement having been made, I will repeat what I have already said. 1-15 p.m. What is it that has been done? Some of the Members of the last Council were appointed as Members to serve on this Committee. Is it the fault of the constituencies, I ask, that some of those Members have been returned to this new Council?”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—“May I ask one question, Sir, whether the voters knew anything about this?”

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT:—“Will the hon. Member kindly sit down and allow the hon. the Law Member to proceed?”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“The proceedings of this Committee were published in the press.

(At this stage the hon. the President took the Chair.)

“I take it, Sir, that the constituencies, when they elected these Members to the Council, knew that they were Members of the Irrigation Bill Committee, they knew that they had chosen to serve on the Committee and to help the Government in the situation in which it found itself. And to suggest as my hon. Friend, the Member for the University, suggests, that it is placing men in a false position to appoint them to places as Members of a committee designed to consider problems of real importance, is not only illogical, but is really a reflection upon the impartiality and the sense of justice of the Members of this House and of gentlemen who knew their business. That is only by way of prefatory remarks to what I have to say.

“What has the Government done? Here is a Bill which this House threw out on certain points. Endeavours have been made in this Bill to meet those points, and in order to ascertain how far we can succeed in the attempt, a Committee has been brought into existence. Does my hon. Friend, the Member for the University, suggest that if the Member for Irrigation—as he has every right to do—took nobody’s counsel but his own, re-wrote that Bill, and brought it forward to the House, that is a proper procedure?”

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI:—“Yes.”

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR:—“I hear ‘yes’. These interjections seem to me, Sir, to display a temperament which is lamentable. I make bold to say that people who will say ‘yes’ when a question of that kind is put, do not evince that sense of responsibility which ought to animate Members of this House. I submit that when a Member of Government appoints a Committee and takes for his assistance other Members from the Council, men who have ripe experience of the subject, to say that to do so is to handicap them on the ground that they cannot be expected to bring to bear a fresh mind on the subject when they become Members of this Council, is a reflection on them which will be resented, and I hope properly resented, by Members of this House. It seems to me that that is a temperament which ought to be deprecated and the House ought to be protected against a frame of mind which makes reflections such as those and assumes an attitude entirely derogatory to the dignity and the good traditions of this House.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“I am sorry, Sir, to intervene in this debate, but it is better that we realize our position so far as this

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [14th December 1923]

question is concerned. The question relates to the appointment of some Members of this Council to a committee for the purpose of discussing the Irrigation Bill. On this point I must say that I entirely differ from the hon. Member for the University, Mr. Satyamurti, and I must say that the Government should find opportunities of meeting Members of this Council as often as possible in various committees whenever it is possible to reconcile the different views of the Members of this House. I was myself a Member of this Committee. I may also say that I was not one of those who opposed the original introduction of the Bill in this House. I was one of the minority that supported its introduction. The majority of the House voted against its introduction and therefore it was thrown out. As one who had supported the introduction of the Bill, as one who very much regretted that the Bill should have been fully thrown out, and as one who thought that it would have been better probably to have amended it properly in the Select Committee, I took advantage of this Committee to meet various friends who held different views on this Bill and to talk to them as to what could be done to bring forward a Bill at an early stage in the life of the new Council. I do not understand what the hon. Member for the University means when he says that Members who were on this Committee are likely to find themselves in a difficult position when the Bill again comes up to this House for consideration. I do not know if he means that Members who opposed some measures in the Committee will not repeat their opposition in this House. I do not know if he means that those who supported some provisions of this Bill will not change their views in the Council when they find that sufficient reasons are given against those provisions. The position of such committees is exactly the same as the position of the Select Committees."

Mr. S. SATYAMURTI :—" May I say one word by way of personal explanation, Sir? I have no word to say about Members of the Select Committee. My point was that this was a Committee appointed *ad hoc* by the Executive Government, not as Members of this Council, but as Members in their individual capacity."

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—Knowing that my Friend would not object to the Members of this Council serving on Select Committees, because he was one of the Members of a Select Committee appointed in connexion with one of the Bills, I wanted to compare the position of Members of the Select Committee to that of the Members on this particular Committee. If there is no objection to my Friend and to those who think with him as Members of this Council going to the Select Committee, there can be similarly no objection to Members going into such committees. I will explain myself. Members of the Select Committee may have to express difference of opinion in the Select Committee. The majority may hold a view and the Bill may come up according to the majority of opinion. When the matter comes up before the Council, Members of the Select Committee may have to repeat their opinion which they expressed in the Select Committee, or when sufficient reasons are given in the Council, they may change their views. It is not correct to say that because I was a Member of this particular committee and, as such, gave expression to particular views, I should stick to them in the Council even when sufficient reasons are given against the view I hold in spite of the fact that the majority held a different view. I am one of those who

14th December 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

think that Members of the Government should try to meet Members of the Council and non-official opinion outside more often than at present. There is no use in their shutting themselves up in camera and doing things as they please, but I would ask them as responsible persons to take Members of this Council and members of the outside public into their confidence when such questions arise. I think that has been the practice as regards several Bills before. We have had a number of committees appointed with the object of bringing in Bills later on. That was the object when an Andhra University Committee was appointed; that was why a Secondary Education Committee was appointed; and that was the reason why the Religious Endowments Bill Committee was appointed; and if only the constitution of the Religious Endowments Bill Committee was different, we might not probably have had so many objectionable features in it. All that I say is that as often as possible and at as many stages as possible, the Government should take Members of this Council and members of the outside public into their confidence before they decide upon any particular course of action. If, therefore, in this particular Bill, the Irrigation Bill, which I have always considered very useful, Government have taken steps to consider public opinion with a view to change some of their views—it is rather difficult that the bureaucracy should do so—if they have taken steps to invite opinion from some non-official members of this Council to come to their aid to enable them to change their views in conformity with public opinion, I think it is very desirable that they should do so always. As a Member of the Committee, I may once more say that I am not bound by any decisions of the Committee. I still retain the liberty of speaking out my own views. I therefore say that such committees are very welcome and so this Grant for the travelling allowance of Members, which is after all not a very important matter, may be sanctioned.”

The Motion was put and carried and the Grant was made.

Grant XVIII.

The hon. the RAJA OF PANAGAL :—“ Mr. President, I beg to move—

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 19,100 under ‘Medical--Transferred’ to be provided from savings under Grant VIII—General Administration—Reserved.

“ Sir, hon. Members may have been aware that in December last there was a special Grant made of Rs. 27,000 for the purchase of the equipment required for the teaching of bio-chemistry and bio-physics in the Madras Medical College. The equipment was, however, not purchased inasmuch as the equipment was to be selected by the bio-chemist who was only very recently appointed. The amount, therefore, lapsed. Now that orders have been passed for the purchase, out of the amount of Rs. 27,000, we can have as much as Rs. 7,900 to be reappropriated from the savings of the amount allotted for the salary of the bio-chemist, and the balance can be met from the general savings under Grant VIII. In these circumstances, the Grant is necessary.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Before we rise for lunch, I would like to say how I have ruled as follows on the point of order raised the other day in regard to the Motion of Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.

[The President]

[14th December 1923]

III

RULING BY THE PRESIDENT REGARDING THE PREROGATIVE OF HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR IN RESPECT OF APPOINTMENTS.

“On the 11th December the hon. Member, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, moved:—

That this Council recommends to the Government that one of the Deputy Directors of Agriculture, who is a Graduate in Agriculture and possesses the necessary district experience, be appointed as the Principal of the Agricultural College at Coimbatore.

“After the Motion was duly seconded, the hon. the Law Member raised a point of order in relation to this Motion, his object being to secure that Motions of this kind are regulated by some uniform procedure. The point raised by the hon. the Law Member was that the Principalship of the Agricultural College was one of the appointments which had to be made by the Governor; that though advice might be given to the Governor in regard to the making of the appointment, such advice was after all only advice; the point was whether, having regard to the prerogative of the Governor in the matter, the topic should be allowed for discussion, whether the Council should take upon itself to recommend that the Governor's discretion should be used in a particular way. After a somewhat desultory discussion the Motion was adjourned to this day, so as to enable me to give a considered ruling on the point raised.

“I would first premise that Agriculture is a Transferred Subject, and under section 52 (3) of the Government of India Act the Governor in relation to Transferred Subjects, *shall* be guided by the advice of his Ministers unless he sees sufficient cause to dissent from their opinion, in which case he may require action to be taken otherwise than in accordance with that advice. Under section 134 (4) ‘Local Government’ means the Governor acting with Ministers in the case of Transferred Subjects. In regard to the Principalship of the Agricultural College the proposal of Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar is that the Minister should so advise the Governor that the appointment shall be filled up in a particular way. The recommendation is to the Government, that is, to the Governor acting with his Ministers. And though the Governor is not bound to accept the advice of his Minister in this—or for the matter of that, in any other matter relating to a Transferred Subject—the Council, I take it, is not precluded from offering its advice, which, I presume, is intended primarily for the Minister. I need hardly point out at this stage that under the reformed constitution which has been set up, the Ministers are amenable to the control of the Legislative Council to an extent to which the Members of the Executive Council are not.

“I now pass to Rule 10 of the Devolution Rules regulating the exercise of authority over members of public services, framed under section 45-A of the Government of India Act. Here it is explicitly laid down that the authority vested in the Local Government over officers of the public services shall, in the case of officers serving in a department dealing with Transferred Subjects, be exercised by the Governor acting with the Minister in charge, provided that (a) no order affecting emoluments or pensions, no order of formal censure, and no order on a memorial shall be passed to the disadvantage of an officer of an All-India or Provincial Service without the personal concurrence of the Governor, and (b) no order for the posting of an officer

RULING BY THE PRESIDENT REGARDING THE PREROGATIVE OF HIS 471
EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR IN RESPECT OF APPOINTMENTS.

14th December 1923]

[The President]

of an All-India Service shall be made without the personal concurrence of the Governor. It seems to me that the hon. Member Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar's Motion refers to a matter of administration rather than to the posting of an officer of an All-India service. But even if it is construed in the latter sense, it is clear that the Minister should, if the Motion is passed, seek the Governor's concurrence to the posting of an officer of a particular type. I fail to see where the question of His Excellency the Governor's prerogative comes in. To say that the Minister shall not take action of a particular kind without the Governor's personal concurrence is very different from saying that the Governor has a prerogative of action which can be exercised, if he wishes, even without consulting the Minister.

"Further, we have had a number of precedents during the last three years in which this Council passed Motions recommending to the Government of the day to take action of a particular kind in regard to appointments to particular services. A list* of these Motions is appended to this ruling. Some of the Motions go back to the pre-Reform days. Only once, throughout this period did the hon. Member, the Leader of the House, mention in this connexion the prerogative of the Governor, but he did not raise it as a point of order. Not only so; but in all the cases the Government took part in the debate and in more than one instance the original Motion was amended on the Motion of a Member of the Government.

"It seems to me, therefore, that the point of order raised should not be allowed. I therefore disallow it."

The House then adjourned for lunch at 1-35 p.m.

The House re-assembled after lunch at 2-30 p.m. with the hon. the Deputy President in the chair.

MOTIONS FOR REAPPROPRIATION FOR 1923-24—cont.

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT :—"The question before the House is the Motion made by the hon. the Raja of Panagal before the lunch interval, that the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 19,100 under 'Medical—Transferred'. (After a pause), I shall put the Motion to the House."

The Motion was put and carried and the Grant was made.

Grant XXXIV.

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Mr. President, I beg to move—

That the Government be granted an additional sum of Rs. 13,400 under '31. Education—Primary—Reserved—for grants to local bodies for Primary Education (Agency)' to be provided from savings under 'Grant XVII. Education—Transferred'.

"The reasons for making this Motion for a Grant are given in the Memorandum of the hon. the Finance Member placed on the Council table. As I observe that an hon. Member has given notice of a proposition which will raise a discussion on this subject, I shall not say anything more now. While I am perfectly prepared to furnish this House any further information they may require on this particular matter, I think it will be convenient if I postpone what I have to say till after my hon. Friend opposite has raised his points."

[Mr. A. R. Knapp]

[14th December 1923]

"In regard to the other point relating to the small item of Rs. 1,080, I may say that my hon. Friend is entitled to ask why the hon. the Minister could not have spent the amount on his own schools. But in regard to the item of Rs. 12,320, he could not have done so because that was accidentally put in the Budget under a Transferred head instead of in a head of mine."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—"In regard to item (i), I am fully satisfied, and I may supplement the remarks of the hon. the Home Member and give some more information to him. In the year 1920-21, when the formation of the Agency was proposed, some portions of the Agency were under the management of the taluk boards and they were asked to run the institutions in those places till the 1st of October 1921, and Government promised to pay the taluk boards that amount later on. That old debt is now proposed to be discharged by the Government to the taluk boards. I now feel that that is justifiable and that it is only a misplacement of figures in the Transferred Half in the Budget, and therefore I do not question it.

"With regard to the second item, the hon. the Home Member was kind enough to state that I am right in questioning the transference, and he left it to be justified by the hon. the Minister for Education, and his silence when that was suggested by the hon. the Home Member merely shows that he pleads guilty to the surrender of the amount."

Mr. R. VEERIAN :—"I was keeping quiet since this morning as I was not feeling well. Now, why should I remain mute especially in matters of this sort? As far as the depressed classes are concerned, education alone will improve them. I do not know if any hon. Member will object to it. Certainly the members of the depressed classes are now being kept in utter ignorance. Therefore, Sir, I hope that the whole House will unanimously support the Motion. Delay, I consider, is very dangerous. Therefore, Sir, I appeal to the hon. Members of this House to give their unanimous support if they are genuine in ameliorating the condition of the depressed classes. I will politely put it like that without wasting much time of the Council. I again appeal to hon. Members of this Council to support the Motion."

The Amendment was by leave withdrawn.

The original Motion was then put and carried and the Grant was made.

IV

MOTIONS ON MATTERS OF GENERAL PUBLIC INTEREST.

APPOINTMENT OF A DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF AGRICULTURE AS PRINCIPAL OF THE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE.

The Council then resumed discussion on the Resolution of Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar for the appointment of a Deputy Director of Agriculture as Principal of the Agricultural College.*

The hon. Diwan Bahadur T. N. SIVAGNANAM PILLAI :—"My hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, moves that in appointing principals selection

* That this Council recommends to the Government that one of the Deputy Directors of Agriculture, who is a Graduate in Agriculture and possesses the necessary district experience, be appointed as the Principal of the Agricultural College at Coimbatore.

14th December 1923] [Mr. T. N. Sivagnanam Pillai]

should be made from those holding the position of Deputy Directors of Agriculture with the additional qualifications of being a graduate in agriculture and having district experience. So far as the principle of the Motion is concerned, I am one with him. It is highly necessary that a man with district experience should be posted as Principal because he is likely to know the needs of the students who come from the various portions of the Presidency. Of the eleven deputy directors who are now in service, six are now on probation, one is on foreign service, one has poor educational qualification, one is vacant, one other is a Director of Agriculture and the last man is a professor of agriculture and he is very junior in scale. In fact he is very low down in the scale. Other things being equal, we will certainly prefer for the place a graduate having district experience. Such a man not being available, we have gone for the best man although he is a research man. As Principal he has to wield power and sway over his research colleagues also. It is, therefore, necessary that a senior man should always be the Principal. If the deputy directors come up to that level in course of time, their claims will certainly be considered and one of them appointed as Principal."

Mr. P. ANJANEYALU :—" May I know if the professor of agriculture was at any time the Deputy Director of Agriculture also ?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur T. N. SIVAGNANAM PILLAI :—" He is borne on the cadre of deputy directors."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, the hon. the Minister for Development has conceded the principle underlying the Motion before the House. If so, I expect it is up to him to carry the principle into operation, especially as it is one which affects the welfare of the students. The Coimbatore College has been established at the expense of a large amount of money and year after year we are incurring a large recurring expenditure also. I asked in the course of my speech to furnish me with the figures of admission each year and I am told that the admission is about six each year. If so there is no justification for incurring so much expenditure on that institution. After all what is the Minister's objection to appoint a competent man as Principal of the college? It is not that the deputy directors are not competent to hold the post, but because they are juniors. Is that a sin on their part and can that be a reason why a senior should be inflicted on the students though not competent? In making these appointments the interests of the students and the country should be borne in mind. There are in this institution a number of officers who are competent and I do not mind who is appointed. There is the mycologist, the lecturing botanist, the lecturing chemist, and the professor of agriculture. The professor of agriculture is intimately connected with the students more than any other professor. He is the man who works with the students every morning in the fields and in the day, in the class rooms and elsewhere. He is one who is more or less in charge of the students and he goes along with them for excursions. That is the kind of man who ought to be in charge of these institutions. The present Principal is one who ought to do his work in seclusion. To inflict on him the administrative work and take away the legitimate work from him is a proposition which I think will not be acceptable to any one in this House,

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [14th December 1923]

Well, the hon. the Minister may at least take the earliest opportunity that offers itself before him and appoint a suitable man for the place in the interests of the students and the country at large."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur T. N. SIVAGNANAM PILLAI :—"That is the sum and substance of what I said. I shall bear his request in mind."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"I suppose the hon. Minister is one who says little and does much. On that supposition I accept his assurance and withdraw the Resolution." (Cheers.)

The Resolution was by leave withdrawn.

SUSPENSION OF THE ENHANCED RATE OF LAND REVENUE IN THE
TANJORE DISTRICT.

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :-- "Sir, I beg to move—

12. *That this Council recommends to the Government that the collection of land revenue at the enhanced rate in the Tanjore district from January 1924, be suspended for one year at least till the principles of land revenue settlement are embodied in legislation.*

3 p.m.

"Sir, most of the things which I will have to say on this Resolution have already been discussed yesterday and on two or three occasions in the last Council, and the principle underlying this Resolution, that the resettlement coming into force as the result of the resettlement operations ought to be postponed till the principles governing the resettlement are put on a legislative basis, has been accepted by this House by a very large majority yesterday, so that I think it is not necessary for me to dilate again on the question why the principles of settlement ought to be put on a legislative basis. It has been accepted by a very large majority and I now propose to refer to a few facts which may, I submit, influence hon. Members of this House to decide on the very same principle. I will give the House a few further grounds which will make them go to the extent of saying that this principle ought to be applied to every district. There is a general impression, and I do not say it is absolutely unfounded, that Tanjore is one of the most fertile districts of this Presidency. I do not say it is not. It is a fertile district and compared with many other districts it is more fertile than the others. But at the same time we have to consider the rate of taxation we have to pay in the Tanjore district and how it compares with the land-tax paid in other districts. In this connection I should like to go a little further back, that is, to the period of the last resettlement operations, about the year 1891. The total assessment paid by the Tanjore district at that time was about 45 lakhs. The settlement period had come and the correspondence between the Madras Government and the Government of India began from the year 1888 and the Madras Government thought that Tanjore was very highly taxed even then and decided that in any event the tax ought not to be increased in that district. That was the recommendation of the Madras Government; but the Government of India thought otherwise; they thought, perhaps, for the purpose of squeezing out the provincial revenues as contribution to the Indian Exchequer, that settlement should go on and they decided to increase the tax in that district by 18 lakhs. The Madras Government did not approve of the action of the Government of India and said that if there was to be any increase at all, it ought not to go beyond 11 lakhs; and actually the increase came to about

14th December 1923] [Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar]

12 lakhs. In their report, the Madras Government have said that Tanjore was already heavily assessed and considering the prosperity to be assured to the small holders of that district, they would not be justified in increasing the assessment. In spite of the protests of the Madras Government, they were forced to raise the tax by 29 per cent, so much so that even in the year 1891 the tax was raised by 29 per cent, which ought not to have been done. What is now proposed to be done is to raise the tax by another 25 per cent in the case of some lands and by $18\frac{3}{4}$ per cent in the case of the other lands. Now, the question before this House is whether it is justifiable to raise the assessment in that district. To show that Tanjore is already paying a heavy rate of assessment, I wish to draw the attention of the House to a few figures in the report of the settlement operations for the year 1920-21. Hon. Members will find from the report that the total cultivated area of ryotwari land in this Presidency is about 26 million acres and the net revenue, excluding the water-cess and other miscellaneous taxes, is about 55 millions; so much so that in the average for the Presidency, the land tax is about Rs. 2 or Rs. 2-1-0 per acre. For Tanjore district alone the assessment that is now being levied is about 55 lakhs or $5\frac{1}{2}$ millions. The extent of cultivated area both wet and dry is about 1,100,000 acres. This works up to an average of Rs. 5-8-0 per acre, whereas the average for the Presidency is only Rs. 2 or Rs. 2-1-0, that is to say, Tanjore is paying 275 per cent of the tax which other districts are paying. What is proposed to be done now under the present resettlement is to raise the assessment by another 12 lakhs. That is, the total assessment under the new settlement, if it comes into force, will be 67 lakhs, so that the rate of taxation will come to about Rs. 6-12-0 per acre. Is this justifiable? Whatever the fertility of the Tanjore district may be compared with other districts, I submit to the House with some confidence that it will require a very strong case for the Government to make out before they can increase the taxation. A perusal of the report of the Settlement Officer himself—he himself made it with certain hesitation—will enable hon. Members of this House to think that I am justified in making the demand which I am now making. I need not now enter into the details of the various settlement operations. They have been discussed clearly yesterday by Mr. Legh. The first operation in the settlement process is the classification of lands, and as regards the classification of lands, Mr. Jackson, the Settlement Officer, and the Collector of Tanjore, say that the classification of lands is not satisfactory and that the lands in the higher classes have to be reduced to lower classes and that the classification of irrigation sources is not correct. The Settlement Officer says that if ryots apply for the lower classes, then such a classification will have to be gone into. Mr. Dutt, in his report, says that irrespective of any applications from ryots for lower classification or with regard to the irrigation sources, it is the duty of the Settlement Officer to lower or take the necessary action. So that both the Collector and the Settlement Officer feel convinced that in some cases at least the classification ought to be lowered both as regards the nature of the soil and the irrigation sources.

“After the classification of the soil, the standing outturn for each classification of lands is taken to be the basis of the outturn for that land. I may quote an example and make myself clearer. The lands in the Tanjore district are divided into various classes bearing various rates of assessment, ranging

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar] [14th December 1923]

from Rs. 14 to Rs. 3 an acre. The first-class lands pay Rs. 14 an acre. They are expected to yield a standing outturn of 1,300 Madras measures per acre. And this does not take into account the harvesting charges which are paid in grain on the harvesting field itself. The harvesting charges come to, roughly, about 6 per cent. Adding this, the average yield for a first-class land in the Tanjore district ought to be about 1,400 Madras measures per acre. It makes the mouth of any Tanjore ryot water to be told that 1,400 Madras measures could be got out of one acre. In Tanjore, according to the calculation there, this comes to 59 kalams an acre, or about 19 kalams per mah. I submit this with confidence that no mirasdar has yet actually realized this quantity. These are all calculations for the first-class lands. As regards inferior lands, lands paying Rs. 8, 7, 6 per acre, Mr. Jackson himself shows in page 44 of his report that the standard outturn which is taken as the basis for settlement operations is more than what is ascertained by actual experience. For the Rs. 6 land the standard outturn is 600 measures. The outturn for three blocks which were taken for the purpose of experimenting is 392, 431, 455 measures, so that the actual yield in one case was below two-thirds and in the other below three-fourths than the standard outturn. For the Rs. 7 land the standard outturn is 700 measures per acre. But the real outturn is 471. Thus hon. Members will see that the standard outturn is at least 30 per cent more than the actual outturn. Of course he gives the statement that the lands have not been properly cultivated, and he says that these details are taken from the lands taken by the Manganallur farm for the purpose of experimenting cultivation. I think a reference to these figures alone shows that the standard outturn has been put too high.

“The next question is about the commutation prices. The standard outturn is taken and that is converted into the market value according to the commutation rates. The commutation rate in this case has been calculated on the basis of the prices ranging during the twenty years prior to the settlement. Mr. Jackson himself in his settlement report says that the prices in the year 1918-19 were very high. Considering that during the next year, i.e., 1919-1920, the prices were the same as those in the previous year he had not chosen to decrease the rates. I may submit that if the prices ruling in the year 1918-19 were excluded, the average price would be decreased. The price in 1918-19 was Rs. 4-8-0 or Rs. 4-12-0 per kalam, whereas the average for the previous years was Rs. 3 or Rs. 3-8-0. The year 1918-19 was an abnormal year and one of the reasons that contributed to the rise in prices was the war. In the settlement report Mr. Jackson hopes that the same prices may continue. In this connexion it is necessary for me to refer to the question whether the same prices are likely to continue in future. My opinion is that they do not and will not. My reasons are these. The chief market for the Tanjore paddy and rice was Ceylon. During the war it was considered necessary to prevent export of rice to Ceylon. Thus from 1915-16 there was an embargo on export of rice to Ceylon. Ceylon which was depending on Tanjore paddy and rice had to seek other sources and she went in for Burma rice. The Ceylon Government thought that, instead of depending entirely on foreign countries for its rice, it might extend cultivation. Thus not only is the Burma rice holding the Ceylon market, but cultivation also has been extended in Ceylon. Sir P. Ramanathan when he

14th December 1923] [Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar]

was here told me that the Ceylon Government is giving encouragement to cultivators to cultivate paddy, and in the course of a few years Ceylon will be able to maintain herself without depending upon other countries for its rice. Now, when the chief market for the Tanjore rice has been taken away and when the various causes which contributed to the rise in prices in the Tanjore district during the years 1915 to 1919—the war has ceased and I hope it will not recur again—have disappeared, what guarantee is there, what justification is there, for supposing that the abnormal prices that ruled, during the last four or five years will continue to rule?

3-15 p.m. I am not raising my arguments merely on what may happen or may not happen. I may say for the information of hon. Members of this House that the prices have gone considerably down. Paddy was selling at this season last year at Rs. 3 or Rs. 3-8-0. What is the price now? Samba paddy sells at Rs. 2-8-0 and kuruvai paddy at Rs. 1-15-0 or Rs. 2 per kalam, so that even during the present year the prices have gone considerably down. I am afraid that prices will not hereafter go up unless for some extraordinary reason. How can you expect the same prices which have been ruling during the last five or six years to continue for ever? The commutation prices which have been taken for the purpose of settlement have been based on an average of these high prices ruling for the last five or six years and it comes to Rs. 1-15-0. If a slight reduction is made in this commutation price, the margin which is supposed to be left to the land-holder will be reduced to a very insignificant figure.

“I think, it is necessary, Sir, to go into some more figures and they are these. Hon. Members will find from page 55 of Mr Jackson's report that the majority of the wet lands are of ordinary variety and they are classed as Class 5 land and the assessment per acre is fixed as Rs. 8. According to the report of the Settlement Officer, the margin that will be left to the land-holder after paying the assessment as shown in the last column of the report is Rs. 4-15-0. In column 7 a deduction of Rs. 10 has been made as equivalent to the landlord's share of revenue, so that for one acre of land paying Rs. 8 assessment, the landlord will get after paying an enhanced assessment of Rs. 10 a margin of Rs. 14-15-0. After making all the calculations, if his figures are correct, the landlord is left with only Rs. 14-15-0. If there is a slight deduction made in the commutation price to the extent of half or one anna per kalam, this Rs. 14-15-0 will be reduced. His total outturn in Madras measures is about 34 kalams or about 800 Madras measures, and if a deduction of one anna be made in the cost per kalam the profit will be considerably reduced and it will come to about Rs. 12 or Rs. 13.

“There is one other matter which I want this House to consider and that is this : after the value of paddy is commuted at the commutation rate, deductions are made for expenses of cultivation. This question of expenses of cultivation seems to be a very vexed question in the matter of the settlement. The old and the new rates are given by Mr. Jackson in pages 48 to 50 of his report. This old rate is put down at Rs. 14 per acre. He takes the various items and gives one of the items, viz., the cost of bulls as Rs. 1-5-6 per acre. The basis of his calculation seems to be this : a pair of bulls would cost Rs. 40 and this pair will plough about 5 acres and the

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar] [14th December 1923]

animals will last for about six years; therefore the rate per acre for the landlord would be Rs. 1-5-4. In this connexion I wish to point out that he has entirely forgotten to take into account the allowance for the feeding of the bulls. Can the bulls be fed on straw alone? There is no allowance made for the feeding of the bulls. And now for the purpose of the present calculation he raised it to Rs. 2-11-0 per acre on the basis that the cost of bulls has considerably increased. I respectfully place before this House that this allowance is entirely inadequate and ought to be at least five times of what he has given. Hon. Members will be aware of the fact that a pair of bulls cannot be purchased for Rs. 40 or Rs. 80 now, but it costs Rs. 100 or Rs. 130. There is another fallacy in this calculation, viz., that it does not make allowance for the capital invested by the landlord in the purchase of bulls. Suppose a poor ryotwari landlord invests Rs. 120 or Rs. 130 in the purchase of bulls, is he not expected to get a return on the capital invested by way of interest? If these calculations are made, the rate for bulls per acre will not be so low, and it ought to be Rs. 10 per acre or more."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"Do I understand the hon. Member to say that the cost of bulls alone is Rs. 10 per acre?"

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR:—"Yes; Mr. Jackson in his report says that he has based his calculation for cultivation expenses on the statistics furnished by the various agricultural farms and co-operative societies. There is a co-operative society in Mayavaram which gives an account of cultivation expenses and the cultivation expenses as given by it is considerably more than what is put by him as the basis. Mr. Jackson brushes it aside saying 'if this be the cultivation expenses, I will have to assume that the cultivators of Tanjore district are working the lands at a loss'. So, under these circumstances, I beg to emphasise that the figures given by the Settlement Officers are not correct.

"Beyond what has been taken into account, he says, there are certain lands called Manyams for each cultivator which come to about 20 or 30 cents. It is true Mr. Jackson says that such Manyams exist and they are given to cultivators free, but they are given as a sort of retainer to these cultivators and it is not necessary to take them into account. It is impossible for any landlord to get his servants as and when he requires. A man cultivating 5 acres of land is given 30 cents as Manyam. In calculating the standard outturn of one acre we must calculate in this way, viz., that out of one acre the cultivator takes away 5 or 6 cents and therefore we should take into account only the remaining land. Supposing a tenant cultivates 5 acres of land he is given 20 or 30 cents and the yield from these 20 or 30 cents is given to him besides other payments. Mr. Jackson says that these are unnecessary expenses.

"There is one other thing as regards the expenses and it is this: as I have already said, the cultivation expenses have not been given correctly. Then with regard to the margin which would be left to the landlord, he says for an acre of land after paying Rs. 10 he gets Rs. 14-15-0. He does not take into account the various cesses which the landlord has to pay. He does not take into account the railway-cess, the road-cess, and the education-cess which has been imposed already in certain taluks of the Tanjore district and the latter of which comes to one-fourth anna in the rupee. If

14th December 1923] [Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar]

these charges are deducted, there will be a further reduction from the margin. Supposing the figures given by Mr. Jackson are correct, i.e., the cultivation expenses, the standard of outturn, and all other expenses connected with cultivation, the landlord for one acre of land, after paying Rs. 10 assessment will have a margin of Rs. 13.

"Then Mr. Jackson himself says that the value of land paying Rs. 10 assessment is about Rs. 1,100 per acre. Then it comes to this: if a person invests Rs. 1,100 on one acre of land his profit will be Rs. 13. Will any body that has a knowledge of business methods be willing to take Rs. 13 or Rs. 14 as his return for that investment, not to speak of the personal trouble the landlord himself takes for the cultivation of the land? I submit, not, Sir. If that be so, I do not think any Government with any sense of fairness or care for the prosperity and welfare of the cultivating classes will allow this to go on.

"There is one other matter which I wish to say and that is this: it may be that some of the landlords of the Tanjore district are rich owning 2,000 and 3,000 acres and however high the land tax may be even after paying such an enhanced tax, they may be able to get a fair margin left for their maintenance. But I ask in all seriousness, what is the position of the majority of the landlords? They are people paying less than Rs. 10 assessment, that is to say, people possessing 1 or $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres of land; and what is the margin left to them? It is about Rs. 20 or Rs. 30. Can anybody consider this to

be sufficient for the maintenance of their families? I do not think it is necessary for me to say that this margin of Rs. 25 or Rs. 30 is hardly enough to maintain a family. I may say without any exaggeration that most of the poor ryots are hardly having one meal a day in the district of Tanjore. It may be that people travelling through the district, visit only the towns and consider it prosperous. It requires some trouble to go to the interior of the district and see the huts occupied by the poor ryots and anybody who has seen them will certainly not sanction any proposal for enhancing the rates now levied in spite of the glamour which prevails in the minds of some with regard to the supposed richness of the Tanjore district.

"Sir, there is one argument which may probably be urged against my proposal and which was urged against the Resolution of the hon. Member for Bellary; that, other districts have been resettled and they are paying a higher rate of taxes, and why should Tanjore alone be exempted. I would meet that argument by saying that Tanjore is paying 275 per cent as much as other districts. Further, I do not think that the principle of setting one district against another and creating inter-district jealousies will pay in the long run. The same argument may be applied to the Government of India. In the Legislative Assembly, Members from the other provinces say: 'why should Madras profit? Why should we reduce the Impost from Madras? Why should Allahabad, Calcutta and Bombay vote for a Resolution asking for a reduction of the Madras Impost? It is only a Madras matter.' How do we relish their view? Nobody considers that the other provinces are right in saying that they would not consider the case of Madras. I ask hon. Members to show the same feeling towards Tanjore and tell the Government that they will not be justified in enhancing the assessment in Tanjore, which district, the Government itself said in 1891, was already groaning under heavy

[Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar] [14th December 1923]

taxation. My Resolution is very modest and it does not go to the extent of saying 'there ought to be a remission of taxation.' All that I say is that till the principles of land revenue settlement are placed on a legislative basis, the resettlement may be suspended, and if, according to the principles which that legislation may contain, they think it fit that taxation in Tanjore ought to be raised, let them do it."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Retrospectively?"

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"Retrospectively, if necessary. It is true that the Government may plead financial difficulties. I understand in the last Budget there was a deficit of 30 to 35 lakhs in this Presidency and if my information be correct or if the Retrenchment Committee has been doing any real work in that direction there ought to be a retrenchment of at least 60 or 70 lakhs this year. So that, we will not have a deficit Budget this year. Now, what is it that I have asked for? I ask merely that the increased assessment of 12 lakhs may not be collected this year, and that if after considering all the circumstances in the light of the principles embodied in the Bill—and the hon. the Law Member promises to introduce legislation for this purpose during this Session—this House comes to the conclusion that Tanjore should pay more, this House may take the liberty of asking the Tanjore ryots to pay with retrospective effect. I see no such occasion arising. I am sure if the principles are to be applied to Tanjore, there will be no case made out for increase and my hope will be eventually found to be perfectly right. Therefore I venture to hope that this House will unanimously accept my Resolution in spite of any opposing speeches from the Government benches."

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—"Mr. President, if I rise at this stage to second this Resolution, notwithstanding the attitude, by no means sympathetic, on the part of the Government as it appears from the answer which the hon. the Law Member gave us to-day to an interpellation made by the hon. Member for the University touching this identical point, it is because of the strong feeling that I entertain that the cause of the Tanjore ryot is just and reasonable. The support which the House gave almost by a sweeping majority yesterday to Resolution No. 6 moved by my hon. Friend, Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar, which endorsed, and not only endorsed, but also reaffirmed, this essential point, viz., the necessity for the land revenue settlement being codified and placed on a legislative basis, also encourages me to give my support to this Motion. If I remember rightly, if I understand these principles correctly, I am reminded on this occasion of an application for stay order which we as lawyers often make before courts of appeal, and I therefore take this Resolution in the light of a regular appeal having been lodged by the Tanjore mirasidars in particular, to this House against an order of the Government which the Government wants to execute at once. This is therefore in the nature of an application for a stay order sought to be supported on two main grounds, the first ground being that practically the grievances of the Tanjore mirasidars have not been redressed and the second being that this House wants to show to the Government their firm resolve and determination that these settlement operations should no longer go on under executive orders, but that they should be subject to the legislative sanction. So far as the second part of my argument is concerned, this House has in no uncertain terms placed its seal of approval. As

14th December 1923] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

regards the main point, we have made out a sufficiently strong and *prima facie* case such as to warrant the stay of settlement operations for one year only. For, I find the Resolution is a modest one. It only desires that the introduction of the enhanced rates may be kept in abeyance for a period of one year, at least till the principles of land revenue settlement are embodied in legislation. The reason why the hon. the Mover has fixed the period at one year was probably because he conceived that it might take at least a year, if not more, for any legislation being brought to this Council and passed. If I remember aright, just almost a year ago, almost to a day, Sir Habib-ul-lah stated that the introduction and passing of such a measure might take at least one year, and probably it is in the light of that this Resolution has been worded. Now, we have heard the hon. the Law Member telling us the other day, and which the hon. the Home Member also reiterated, that one such Bill is almost ready. That a Land Revenue Bill, whatever its provisions may be, so far as I am concerned, I have not been taken into the confidence. . . . ”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“I do not think that I said ‘almost ready’. Mr. Siva Rao said that.”

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“In answer to an interpellation that I put, the hon. the Law Member gave us a list of 14 legislative measures that are likely to come up this Session. One of the Bills mentioned therein was dealing with land revenue.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“It was included in the list of legislative measures Government intend to put forward in this Session.”

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—“I lay stress on the words ‘this Session’. This Session means three months, and I do not think it will be introduced during the Budget sitting. I think it is but fair to pass legislation in this matter to prevent Government going on with settlement operations and enhancing settlement rates and to impress upon the Government the desirability and the necessity of their no longer being permitted to have things all their own and in their own fashion and under executive orders. I think it is to lay stress on that point and by way of protest against the present action of the Government that this Resolution has been brought forward. Moreover, I may say that so far as these resettlements are concerned, there are two different points of view. The ryots view it from one point of view and the Government smelling prosperity all round view it from that point of view. About four or five years ago when my district was under resettlement the Government pursued the extreme procedure of enhancing the rates of a certain class of land under the Coleroon irrigation system by $33\frac{1}{3}$ per cent. The then representative of the district, Mr. A. Subbarayulu Reddiyar, put up in this Council a gallant fight on our behalf, but his fight was of no avail. The same was the case in respect of North Arcot. So far as the districts of North Arcot and South Arcot are concerned, they are groaning under heavy taxation. We found ourselves helpless and impotent to get these resettlements based on a legislative basis. Now that power is given to us there is absolutely no reason why we should not avail ourselves of that power and compel the Government to fix the basis of that legislation. Otherwise, if we go on in this fashion permitting district after district to be resettled, then there will be no relief to us. So far as we are concerned we have suffered. The hon. Mover of this Resolution has portrayed to us a

[Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar] [14th December 1923]

vivid picture of the condition of the Tanjore ryots. While I am free to recognize that conditions in Bellary and Anantapur differ fundamentally from those prevailing in the Tanjore district, I would submit that that consideration, by itself, ought not to weigh with us in viewing Tanjore from an entirely different standpoint. For, one main principle which is common to both is the necessity and the determination to see that the principles of land revenue settlement are embodied in legislation, and how are you going to see that your determination is given effect to unless it be that we bring forward and pass Resolutions of this nature? Then it may perhaps be stated that while so far as some districts are concerned the revenue involved is very little, but as regards the Tanjore district the revenue which the Government hope to get is rather large because the present assessment comes to about 55 lakhs, whereas the proposed assessment comes to about 67 lakhs representing 22.06 per cent. Hon. Members of this House are perfectly aware of the fact that the deltaic area in the Tanjore district is divided into 15 or 16 tarams. I went through the report of Mr. Jackson dealing with this area and also the report of Mr. P. C. Dutt wherein the latter differs in some respects from the recommendations of Mr. Jackson and he says that the settlement officer appears to have allowed himself to be influenced mainly by one consideration, viz., the rise in prices. For instance, he says that there was no reclassification of the soil, no irrigation facilities, no commutation rates and other particulars having been taken into consideration. But whatever that may be, so far as the Tanjore mirasidars are concerned, they have a real grievance in the matter. There is absolutely no reason why their wishes should not be respected. I do not regard the answer to question No. 49 given to-day on the part of Government as the last word on the subject. It only indicates the present attitude of the Government and its unwillingness to make a move in the right direction on its own initiative, and I do not think that is indicative of the spirit of the bureaucracy that they will not any longer respect the wishes of the House provided the wishes of the House assert itself in an unmistakably strong language.

“I expect the hon. the Home Member to tell us that though, so far as the Government are concerned, they are not in a mood to suspend the operations of their own accord, they will, if the sense of the House is the other way, be prepared to respect it and not to flout public opinion or disregard the feeling that may be reflected in this House on this question of putting into practical operation their settlement rates. I do not think it necessary at this stage to trouble this House with the various figures which have been placed before it by the hon. the Mover. Mr. Jackson's report came in for a large share of criticism and in my opinion very rightly. As the Mover has referred to the outturn, the commutation rates and other peculiarities of the Tanjore district, I had better not advert to them in detail. It is thought that the Government would be put to the inevitable necessity of losing 12 lakhs of rupees a year. But so far as this Resolution is concerned, it does not want the Government to lose or surrender that amount once and for all. It simply requests the Government to suspend the operations till the rates have been subjected to legislative sanction after the whole thing has been fully discussed and thrashed out in the Legislative Council. If, when the rules are drafted, it is found that the rates are almost the same as those we find in Mr. Jackson's

3-45 p.m.

14th December 1923] [Mr. R. Srinivasa Ayyangar]

report, it will be perfectly open to the Government to ask the Legislature to give them powers to recover the rates with retrospective effect for the period for which they have been kept in abeyance consequent upon this Resolution of the House. I submit that this Resolution is modestly conceived and in seconding this Motion I commend it for the acceptance of the House."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP:—"May I request you, Sir, to state what course you propose to adopt with regard to the two Amendments?"

The hon. the DEPUTY PRESIDENT (from the Chair):—"Does the hon. Member Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyyar wish to move his Amendment?"

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR:—"Sir, the Amendment that stands in my name is this:—

'For all the words beginning with "that the collection of land revenue" substitute "that a committee with a majority of elected members of this Council be appointed to consider the proposals made for the resettlement of the Tanjore district, and the Government Order thereon, and propose the changes they would recommend within three months, that the Government Order be modified in the light of the recommendations of the committee and that pending the final decision, collection of revenue be made on the basis of the existing rates and that the enhancement that may ultimately be decided upon be collected as a special instalment in the last month of current fasli."

"We have heard now from two hon. Members about the state of Tanjore and about the report of the resettlement of Tanjore that has been made. The Government have passed final orders and from what I have heard there is a difference between the report itself and the recommendations made by the Collector and also between them and what my hon. Friends here represent to be the actual state of the Tanjore district. They vary very much. It has been said that when the Settlement Bill is passed everything will be clear. It will be easy to go into all these matters and decide. It is also said that when the Bill is passed, everyone will find that there is no case for resettlement in Tanjore district. I am very sceptical about this. The principles have been there already; it is only the major portion of the principles that are there, that are going to be codified and in some cases with a few modifications. But the real difficulty comes in in the application of those principles. For instance, one big question that has been agitating this Council has been the cost of cultivation that is to be allowed for, and the other the average rate of prices that is to be taken into consideration. About these two matters there have been constant difficulties. The people have been always dragging one side while the Government have been dragging just the other way. So the main difficulty is in the application of the principles and not in the principles themselves. Even if a law for resettlement of districts is going to be passed at once, I do not believe that it is going to bring about very great changes in the actual resettlement of districts. In the case of Tanjore all the materials have been collected by the Settlement party, the Collector has made enquiries and he has himself stated his view on the matter. It seems to me that this is a case in which all that remains to be done is to create an agency of the sort of a court of assessors who will be prepared to go into all these things and express their views. That is what is wanted and not an enunciation of fresh principles

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar] [14th December 1923]

of resettlement. It is in that view that I propose the amendment that a committee may be appointed to go into the whole question and make their recommendations. After all the Resolution itself says that resettlement will be held over for one year. If we may take the possible contingencies, if for instance our resettlement is correct and enhanced rates ought to be paid, I do not see any reason why for one year any special concession should be shown to one district. The case of Bellary was quite different. It is not only on account of the fact that the principles were not codified, but also because that the material and financial conditions of Bellary were very very bad that we agreed to postponing the bringing into force of all the resettlement rates in that district. In the case of Tanjore no doubt, as I said, a case has been made out for a sort of further inquiry. All that is possible to say about it is only that. No case has been made out for indefinitely postponing the settlement for any other reason. The only question to decide is whether Government is correct in enhancing the settlement rates to the extent of 11 lakhs. All that is necessary is to appoint a court of assessors who will be prepared to go into these matters and advise Government. If this is done, I submit that Tanjore district will have no grievance whatever. I hope that Government will see the justice of the case, and understanding that what I propose does not mean any real loss to them, will accept the Amendment I have proposed."

Mr. M. E. SETURATNAM AYYAR :—"Sir, I have great pleasure in seconding the Amendment."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"Mr. President, Sir, I am thankful to my hon. Friend, the Mover of the Amendment for one reason. He has, in the last part of his Amendment, been good enough to suggest that even if the Committee's bill is put in operation there is likely to be some enhancement. He said the same thing in his speech. I am glad that he has recognized that point. Because, the tendency has hitherto been to suggest that the whole idea of enhancing the rates in the Tanjore district is monstrous, and not to be contemplated by this House.

"But as regards the substance of his Amendment, Sir, I hope he will forgive me if I say that I regard his proposal as *extraordinary*. What is it that he proposes? It is that the final decision as to whether the orders already passed should stand or not should be left to his Committee. He talks about a court of assessors, but what he proposes is more like the court of appeal to which another hon. Member has referred—a court of appeal with final powers."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"The Court will have no final powers, Sir. The Government may in the light of the recommendations of the Committee modify their rules. I do not mean that it should have final powers."

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—"I understand that an injunction is laid on Government to modify their orders in the light of the recommendations of the Committee. If that does not mean that the Committee has final authority, I don't know what it does mean. I read the Amendment as it stands on the paper. I will go further and say, Sir, that it seems to me that it is not complimentary to this Council. It comes to this: neither the Government nor this Council is competent to give a decision on this matter. They are

14th December 1923]

[Mr. A. R. KNAPP]

to refer it to a committee, not of this House wholly, but only the majority of it coming from this House and the rest consisting of gentlemen coming from outside. I am afraid I cannot accept the proposal. I am quite prepared to look at this question of Tanjore resettlement and argue it on its own merits, and to consider the sufferings of the unfortunate Tanjore ryot. But it seems to me to be very inadvisable to switch off, as it were, to a line of this kind. As I have said before, the proposal which has been put forward would really mean that the Government should place the final disposal of the whole matter in the hands of a fresh committee."

Mr. G. F. PADDISON:—"Mr. Chairman, this is a matter upon which I feel great personal interest. I have been a Settlement Officer myself for several years of my life, and therefore I think that as regards the principles of Tanjore resettlement, I would be in a position to give what might be held to be an expert opinion on the matter.

4 p.m. "I do not think that my pretensions to being an expert will be considered unworthy to the least degree. I think I need say this much that there is a very great misunderstanding about our settlement operations which I should like to correct, as to their object, their traditions. The idea seems to be that the Settlement officers are sent out with the tradition and teaching, with the avowed object of getting more money to Government. Having served under the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter when he was the Commissioner for Settlement and being taught in the matter by other men who gave me my budding ideas on the subject, I may say that that is far from being the object of the operations. In actual practice, in my time, I have found in the districts which I have settled that very frequently I may say what I had to do was not to raise but to lower the assessment. I may cite the instances of the far-off district of Ganjam and the district of Guntur down to the tailend of Bapatla where when the Settlement department left, they left with reduced assessment. I am aware that in Guntur we reclassified the soil on the sole reason that excess had been levied and the soil was wrongly classified and in consequence the levy was too high. Only the other day at Trichinopoly when I had been there I was asked by the Settlement Officer there to go in company with Mr. Seturatnam Ayyar to inspect some lands which in his opinion were too highly assessed. I mention this to say that where any land is thought to be assessed high, the first thing to be done is to report it to the Government and to the Board of Revenue for a reclassification of the land. In resettling district after district we try not only to adjust the levies between the various kinds of lands within the same district, but also to get fair play between district and district. I do not want to set district against district. But I do want to say that Tanjore has fair play in respect of its assessment as compared with that in other districts. I am sure the object of the Settlement Commissioner is not to accept any classification which is higher, not merely searching in every corner of the district to find any flaw in the old settlement, but to see whether Tanjore had been over-assessed or not. As regards the appeal made by Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar, I quite understand and respect what he has said. But I wish to mention that here he stands as an advocate of the mirasidars of the Tanjore district to try and persuade this Council to postpone at least, if not to reduce or abolish altogether, the increase which has been recommended by the Settlement Officer in his report and

[Mr. G. F. Paddison] [14th December 1923]

which has been sanctioned by the Government. I remember my first experience as a Settlement Officer. I was going from Guntur to Tenali when on the way I went to a village. When I got there I asked the ryots what the lease value and sale value of land in that village were. They came and told me that land was being sold at Rs. 2,000 an acre and leased at Rs. 50. They gave all sorts of wonderful and glorious figures. As I got these down in my notebook I asked them, 'What do you think I have come here for?' They answered: 'To acquire lands for the Tenali Railway.' Well, Sir, my point is this. I wish to impress the House with the fact that the mirasidars of Tanjore quite naturally as business men and as farmers are really anxious to make out as good a case as they can in their interests.

"Now, let me proceed, if I may, to the case as laid down by Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar. He begins by a reference to the soil classification and classification of irrigation sources. I wish to ask him where he got his idea that Mr Jackson who examined most carefully the classification of the soil said that the classification was bad. On the contrary, in at least two places, he says that it is remarkably good. He clearly says that the classification in the Tanjore district, as in other places, are extraordinarily carefully done and extraordinarily good. In regard to the leasing of the land, the value of the land as leased and as sold corresponds very largely with soil classification which proves, I think, as he says quite clearly, that relatively, whatever else you may say, as between field and field classification in the district is fair. As regards irrigation sources which he next referred to, he did an injustice to the Settlement department and to the Government. He seemed to think that we were not going to touch the irrigation sources. On the contrary in some cases, Mr. Jackson did find out that sufficient allowance was not being paid to the means of irrigation. He puts it down in his report and it has been decided to alter the margin between second and third class villages.

"Next we come to the commutation prices. I shall take first the outturns. They are most difficult to arrive at. I may tell that quite frankly. Wherever you go as Settlement Officer not only in India but in England this difficulty is experienced. I have myself relations who are farmers and I know they do take a pessimistic outlook. I have never met a farmer who did not look at the old days as a golden period when they had magnificent harvest and prices favourable, when the outturns were very good. It is extraordinarily difficult to get correct information. I do not think the figures which Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar quoted are borne out by Mr. Jackson. At page 43 of his report, Mr. Jackson says:

'I have also been able to obtain definite figures as regards the outturn on the non-experimental plots of the Government Farm at Manganallur. The bulk of the land is assessed at Rs. 6, a few fields at Rs. 7 and a small area which, though registered as a single crop, has facilities for double crop cultivation pays Rs. 8. The period covered extends from 1913 to 1919 and the recorded results are absolute outturns not manipulated in accordance with the estimated anna yield. On the 6-rupee land the standard outturn is 600 Madras measures per acre. Of 13 recorded results 7 show an outturn above standard and 6 give an outturn below standard. The average works out to 638 Madras measures per acre. On the 7-rupee land standard outturn is 700 Madras measures per acre. Results are recorded for four single samba crops all of which exceeded standard; the average yield was 797 Madras measures per acre.'

"Later on Mr. Jackson says:

'These figures furnish an interesting corroboration of the results of the oral inquiries about outturn which I have conducted in all the villages which I have visited; in most cases two scales of outturn are quoted: one without manure and the other with manure. The latter generally is fully up to the standard; the former, as might naturally be expected, is below standard.'

14th December 1923] [Mr. G. F. Paddison]

"Then we come to the commutation price. Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar says that high prices ruled up to 1918 or 1919 when this report was written. Well, Sir, what about the years since, 1918--23? If you are going to be fair at any settlement of land revenue, it is but right and proper that you should take into account the later years. The rates must be very much more high if only 20 years prior to 1918 had been taken into consideration. Again, it has been suggested that in Tanjore no years were excluded as famine years. Years are excluded as famine years in Bellary and Anantapur and they are rightly excluded. Famine in the rest of the Presidency is a pleasure to the Tanjore ryot from the business point of view."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"Provided there is no famine in his own district."

Mr. G. F. PADDISON :—"I am yet to hear of a famine year in Tanjore. As regards, Sir, the very difficult question of cultivation expenses, Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar went into the question of the outlay spent on the purchase and maintenance of bulls and said that Mr. Jackson's figures were wrong. Mr. Jackson has no doubt made very careful inquiries, but Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar knows more of the prices of bulls in Tanjore than I. Even after making all allowances, even assuming that Mr. Jackson's figures are right, he says that the ryot is left only Rs. 14 per acre on, I think, the average land in the tract. There is one point which I wish to mention and which has not been raised by Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar. He said nothing about wages. Perhaps he will in his reply. It has been said, I know, that adequate allowance has not been made for wages. Since the Tanjore settlement report was published, I had occasion to go into the question of wages, as I am interested in it as affecting labour conditions, and I can assure the House that this abstract and independent inquiry fully confirmed Mr. Jackson's conclusions. The figures given by Mr. Jackson are fair. Mr. Jackson has said that among the perquisites of the *panniyal* wages and mamuls are also included."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"My hon. Friend will allow me to correct him. Mr. Jackson says it is not necessary to include the maniyam. The reference is to page 52 of the report."

Mr. G. F. PADDISON :—"I was dealing with the question of wages, Sir and not with maniyams, dealt with at page 27 of the report. Mr. Jackson does include the maniyam among the perquisites of the *panniyal*. That is the point that I wish to emphasize. At page 27 of the report, Mr. Jackson says: 'There are still other perquisites to be taken into consideration. In many villages the *panniyal* gets a small area, generally 20 cents or less, of 'maniyam' land for his private cultivation.'"

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—"No, Sir. At page 52, Mr. Jackson says it is not necessary to include it."

Mr. G. F. PADDISON :—"I will look up to it, Sir, later, if my hon. Friend will allow me some time. The main and really important thing in a resettlement that we have to consider is the change in the sale value and the lease value of the land. If, as my hon. Friend says, the best land is sold at Rs. 1,000 per acre, how can it be that the value that the ryot gets is only Rs. 14? My answer is that this sum of Rs. 14 is a very uncertain figure. The sale value of Rs. 1,000 is arrived at by an examination of the

[Mr. G. F. Paddison] [14th December 1923]

deeds in the Registrar's office of sale not at the time of the settlement but taking into account records of the people who bought and sold without any idea of what the settlement was going to result in. Then, Sir, if you look to the lease value during the period between 1914 and 1918, you will find that the average lease value per acre varies on single crop wet lands from Rs. 86 to Rs. 20. On 8-rupee lands, the lease value is Rs. 51-11-0. Mr. Jackson proceeds to say :

‘ Though these figures are of considerable value, they cannot be accepted without some caution. It must again be emphasized that in grain leases for wet lands there is usually a reservation implied, and occasionally expressed, that varam should be applied in case of failure of crop. Again it must be remembered that varam is the rule and lump rent the exception.

“ Then take the sale value or the price of the single crop wet lands. These lands are worth very little. You find that the value or the sale price per acre varies from Rs. 1,000 to Rs. 240 for wet lands, and from Rs. 645 to Rs. 70 for dry lands. I may say that these figures are absolutely clear and absolutely convincing

“ May I say one word in conclusion on the general point, Sir? We are considering whether we should recommend to the Government that the settlement operations in the Tanjore district should be postponed as was recommended yesterday. If I remember aright, the hon. Members, Mr. Krishnan Nayar and Mr. Ramalingam Chettiyar, maintained that there were points of difference between the rates of Tanjore and the rates prevailing elsewhere. Mr. Muttayya Mudaliyar said that the average assessment in the Tanjore district is already three times as much as it is in other parts of the Presidency. That I presume relates to wet and dry lands together. Now, Sir, if we ask the ryots of Bellary or Anantapur or anywhere in the Ceded districts or in the uplands of Trichinopoly or Dindigal, whether they will pay the extra assessment at the rate obtaining in Tanjore or whether they will have the famine, there can be no doubt as to what the answer will be.

“ The next point I would urge is this. You say that the Government must postpone the resettlement. I have tried hard now to convince this House that after the most careful consideration and after the most careful enquiry by every one concerned, it has been found that this increase is fair compared with the rates obtaining in the Presidency. I would ask the House whether we should give 12 lakhs of rupees per annum to the mirasidars of the Tanjore district when all other people are howling for money for their own purposes. I am sure that my hon. Friend the Minister for Education will agree with me in this view, as he wants an Andhra University in the north, and there may be need for another University in the west. And there are other equally important schemes of general welfare. Are we going to put off this resettlement, and if so, are we going to recover double or treble assessment after two or three years' time? It is a very important question to be answered, because supposing that the House and the Government have a difference of opinion on the Revenue Bill and it is referred to a committee, there may be a delay of two years or more. So it means that we are going to give to the mirasidars of Tanjore 12 lakhs of rupees, and I would say to the House, let us be just before we are generous.

“ As regards the other points, Sir, I think I am right in saying that the proposal to have an elected committee . . . ”

14th December 1923]

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—" It is a committee with a majority of elected members which I propose."

Mr. G. F. PADDISON :—" I should like, if I could, to get him to substitute the words 'majority of non-official members' in place of the words 'majority of elected members'. That is a point on which I wanted to speak some time before in this Council. The gentlemen belonging to the depressed and backward classes will feel it very much if they are not represented on the committee. This House, I may say, is composed of many interests and is a model of representative bodies. It does not consist only of elected members. If only elected men are to be taken, what is the use, for instance, of my inducing the hon. the Chief Minister to put a gentleman belonging to the backward classes on a taluk board or district board? Are they in any way inferior to others? Take the hon. Member, Lieutenant Madurai. He represents the Madras Army, the Madras Pioneers, and he served for two and a half years in East Africa. He can say now what exactly the position of Indians in Kenya is. So I hope that the House will agree with me in this matter. If you are going to have only an elected committee, it will not go into these extremely detailed calculations of outturn, etc., and it will not have time to go into any detailed examination of the whole question. Much time may be spent in the course of the consideration, and the introduction of the rates may not be possible till the following fasli, and meanwhile these 12 lakhs, to which I have referred, will have gone out of the general revenues of this Presidency. I would therefore ask hon. Members of this House, regardless of party, to support me in opposing both the Amendment and the original Motion."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Sir, this House exists, if at all, for the main reason that there should be no fresh taxation."

Mr. S. MUTTAYYA MUDALIYAR :—" I may say at once, Sir, for the information of the House that I do not accept the Amendment moved by Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Sir, this House exists for the main reason that there should be no fresh taxation without its consent. That is the general principle and I am at a loss to see why land tax should be an exception. This principle was solemnly asserted yesterday in connexion with the re-settlement of another district and asserted by an overwhelming majority, when we beheld the strange spectacle of only the Ministers voting against that principle. In this case, as in many other cases, it is also significant to notice that it is the Opposition that has been ruling the House, though the office is held by somebody else . . ."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Order, order. Is the hon. Member speaking on the Amendment of Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar?"

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—" Yes, Sir, I am going to it."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I observe that the hon. Member has taken a lot of time in talking, and when asked whether he is talking on the Motion, he says that he is going to talk on it. I think I am entitled to say that it is not very respectful to the House that any hon. Member should spend valuable time in talking admittedly on something else; and, however valuable the matter spoken about may be, it is certainly not a matter before the House. Of

[The President]

[14th December 1923]

course, the hon. Member is new to the House, and to the procedure of this House, and I am sure he deserves some consideration. I hope he will not again offend the rules."

Mr. J. A. SALDANHA :—"I beg your pardon, Sir. What I have said already leads to the point. This Amendment proposes a committee of officials and non-officials who are elected members of this House to consider this matter and report thereon. It says also that the Government should be led by the recommendations of this committee. The principle enunciated by the hon. Mover of the Resolution goes further still. It lays down that this House should wait for a year until the necessary legislation embodying the principles of revenue settlement is passed. That might take very long and it might involve a loss of several lakhs of rupees. The principle at the bottom of both the Resolution and the Amendment is practically the same. But I am more in favour of this Amendment, and if it is not passed, I shall support the original Resolution, on the ground that South Kanara is also threatened with resettlement. The distant rumble of the thunder of this resettlement is sounding in our ears, and people are frightened because resettlement is a serious matter for them. It means enormous unsettlement ; it means an army of officers visiting the villages ; it means perhaps a lot of anxiety and trouble which only those who have undergone the same can realize. Therefore, in order to expedite matters, and in order that the Government might not be a loser of large revenues, I would support this Amendment. And of course, in doing so, I am reserving my right to support the main Resolution if the Amendment is not passed. I hope this House will reaffirm the principle which they have so solemnly laid down yesterday, though to some extent in a modified form, with the same practical unanimity as they did yesterday."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—"Sir, I wish to say a few words in support of the Amendment moved by my hon Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar. In doing so, I wish to point out that, so far as the original Resolution is concerned, it merely suggests that the collection of land revenue at the enhanced rates be suspended for one year at least till the principles of revenue assessment are embodied in legislation. It does not go further than that ; it does not, for instance, indicate the further steps to be adopted for the purpose of determining whether the enhanced rates ought to be allowed or abolished or be reduced. It is merely for the purpose of providing the machinery by which it is possible to arrive at a conclusion as to the reasonableness or otherwise of the rates that my hon. Friend, Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar, suggests the appointment of a Committee consisting of a majority of elected Members of this Council to make proposals in that direction.

4-30 p.m. "The objection taken by the hon. the Home Member regarding the powers which are to be assigned to the Committee no doubt deserves some consideration. Nobody would suggest for a moment that this Council should abdicate its functions regarding the fixing of the rates of assessment in respect of this settlement and should transfer all its powers to the Committee. Nobody would accept that position, and it is a position which no one will tolerate. But I take it, Sir, that the wording of the Amendment does not warrant that construction which the hon. the Home Member tried to put upon it, because in the first portion of the

14th December 1923] [Mr. A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu]

Amendment it is distinctly stated that this Committee is to propose the changes they would recommend within three months. The mere fact that the Committee is authorized to recommend changes in the resettlement rates is quite sufficient to satisfy this House that the Committee is not proposed to be invested with absolute powers in the matter of fixing of rates. The further use of the words—

‘that the Government order be modified in the light of the recommendations of the Committee’

does not imply that immediately after they make recommendations, the Government should have no other alternative to consider those proposals than straight off passing orders accepting the recommendations of the Committee. I think, Sir, that is not the construction to be put upon those words and I am sure that the hon. the Mover of the Resolution himself did not intend those words to carry any such meaning. The idea which is intended to be carried out by this Amendment is that a Committee consisting of elected members of this House should be in a better position to examine all those proposals in detail and make recommendations as to what rates ought to be adopted in the case of the Tanjore resettlement. It is for the purpose of not indefinitely postponing these proposals that the Amendment suggests that the Committee should make their recommendations within a period of three months. It goes further and states that till the Committee make their proposals and till those proposals are considered by the Government, the old rates may be adopted and that any additional rates may be recovered by an additional instalment. Therefore, Sir, so far as this Amendment is concerned, it is one which must satisfy all the hon. Members of this House. In view of the remarks made by the hon. Mover of this Resolution, I think we can be satisfied that there is a case for further enquiry and that such an enquiry as has been suggested by this Amendment would satisfy hon. Members; and so long as it suggests that any further increase which is contemplated may be recovered later on, I do not think the hon. the Home Member ought to oppose this Amendment.

“In the course of his remarks, the hon. Member, Mr. Paddison, took exception to the wording of this Amendment in so far as it referred to the elected members of this House. He did not raise any objection to the idea of a Committee going into these proposals, but his main objection was that in so far as there are several nominated members in this Council, there should not be any impression created that they are of an inferior status, or anything of that sort, and that they should also have a place in the Committee. May I point out to him, Sir, that the Committee proposed by this Amendment does not exclude the appointment of nominated members? All that it suggests is that there should be a majority of elected members. It is a well acknowledged principle that if a Committee of this House is to be appointed, those who even to-day according to the constitution of the House form the majority, should have the preponderating voice in the deliberations of that Committee. If once Mr. Paddison realizes that this Council consists of a large majority of elected members, it is not unreasonable for my hon. Friend, the Mover of this Resolution, to ask that in the Committee to be appointed, the elected members who already form a large majority in this Council should have a preponderating voice.”

[14th December 1923]

Mr. G. F. PADDISON:—" May I rise to offer a word of personal explanation, Sir? What I said was that I would not object to the Committee having a majority of non-official members, if the hon. the Mover of the Amendment wished to have any particular majority. I do not know if I have made myself quite clear on that point. For instance, the hon. Members, Mr. Srinivasan and Mr. Virayan there, representing a large class, are representatives of a definite class of people who cannot be represented otherwise. I do not want to have any distinction made between elected and nominated members of this Council."

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—" I may inform the hon. Member, Mr. Paddison, that we have not the slightest objection to nominated members being appointed members of this Committee. I am only trying to justify the Amendment as it stands. The Amendment which suggests that in the Committee the elected members should be in a majority is not unreasonable considering the composition of the Council. But I may at once state, Sir, that if an Amendment like the one suggested, viz., that a majority of non-official members ought to compose this Committee, would meet with the acceptance of the hon. the Home Member, I think I would not only support that view, but would also request my hon. Friend Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar not to object in any way to a Committee consisting of a majority of non-official members being appointed. We do not want really to make any distinction between these persons, or to exclude the nominated members. As has been pointed out, their suggestions will certainly be useful in considering matters of this description. If the Amendment suggested a majority of elected members, it was only in view of the present composition of the Council; but if the other alternative suggested by the hon. Member, Mr. Paddison, viz., that a majority of non-official members should compose this Committee, meets with the acceptance of this House, I think we can very well accept that position, and have this matter satisfied."

The Amendment of Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar was then put to the House and *lost*.

Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu demanded a poll, and the House divided as follows:—

Ayes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Rao Bahadur C. Natesa Mudaliyar. | 18. Rao Bahadur C. Gopala Menon. |
| 2. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar. | 19. Mr. C. Maruthavanam Pillai. |
| 3. " A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu. | 20. " Venkatarama Ayyar alias V. Pantulu Ayyar. |
| 4. " C. V. S. Narasimha Raju. | 21. " B. Venkataratnam. |
| 5. Mr. A. Chidambara Nadar. | 22. " Abbas Ali Khan Sahib. |
| 6. " K. Koti Reddi. | 23. " G. Abdulla Ghatala Sahib. |
| 7. " P. Anjaneyulu. | 24. " V. Hamid Sultan Marakkayar. |
| 8. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo. | 25. Khan Bahadur P. Khalif-ul-lah Sahib. |
| 9. Mr. S. Muttayya Mudaliyar. | 26. Mr. T. M. Moidoo Sahib. |
| 10. Rai Bahadur I. M. Narasimhacharlu. | 27. " Muhammad Moosa Sait Sahib. |
| 11. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar. | 28. " T. N. Bava Ravuttar Muhammad Sahib. |
| 12. " V. C. Vellingiri Goundar. | 29. Khan Sahib Saiyid Diwan Abdul Rasaak Sahib. |
| 13. " J. A. Saldanha. | 30. Mr. K. Uppi Sahib. |
| 14. " M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar. | 31. Munshi Abdul Wahab Sahib. |
| 15. " Sami Venkatachalam Chettiyar. | |
| 16. " S. Satyamurti. | |
| 17. " T. Adinarayana Chettiyar. | |

SUSPENSION OF THE ENHANCED RATE OF LAND REVENUE IN THE 495
TANJORE DISTRICT

14th December 1923]

Noes.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter. | 23. Mr. V. Madhava Raja. |
| 2. „ Mr. A. R. Knapp. | 24. „ T. Mallesappa. |
| 3. „ Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Ayyar. | 25. „ T. N. Marthandam Pillai. |
| 4. „ the Raja of Kollengode. | 26. „ B. Muniswami Nayudu. |
| 5. „ the Raja of Panagal. | 27. Rao Bahadur A. M. Murugappa Chettiyar. |
| 6. „ Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro. | 28. Mr. C. Muttayya Mudaliyar. |
| 7. „ Diwan Bahadur T. N. Sivag-
nanam Pillai. | 29. „ B. Obalesappa. |
| 8. Mr. E. W. Legh. | 30. „ K. S. Ponnuswami Pillai. |
| 9. Dr. John Matthai. | 31. „ K. Prabhakaran Tampan. |
| 10. Mr. P. L. Moore. | 32. „ P. T. Rajan. |
| 11. „ G. F. Paddison | 33. „ B. Ramachandra Reddi. |
| 12. „ H. Tireman. | 34. Rao Bahadur P. Raman. |
| 13. S. R. Y. Ankinedu Prasad Bahadur. | 35. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar. |
| 14. Mr. Ari Gowder. | 36. „ J. D. Samuel. |
| 15. „ P. K. A. S. Arumuga Nadar. | 37. Rai Bahadur Sir K. Venkatarreddi
Nayudu. |
| 16. „ A. V. Bhanoji Rao. | 38. Mr. P. V. S. Sundaramurti. |
| 17. „ Devendrudu. | 39. Rao Bahadur C. Venkataranga Reddi. |
| 18. Sir P. Iyagaraya Chettiyar. | 40. Mr. M. Ratnaswami. |
| 19. Rao Sahib S. Ellappa Chettiyar. | 41. „ W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar. |
| 20. Rao Bahadur Cruz Fernandez. | 42. „ R. Srinivasa Ayyangar. |
| 21. Mr. P. V. Gopalan. | |
| 22. Rao Bahadur K. Krishnaswami Nayudu. | |

31 hon. Members voted *for* the Amendment and 42 *against* it. The Amendment was lost.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The Council will now resume discussion on the original Motion.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ Sir, I support the proposition before the House and I shall state a few reasons for my attitude. First of all, the one important reason is this, that we must support it as a matter of consistency. Yesterday the House by a very large majority passed a Resolution practically identical with the present one, except that it referred to the district of Bellary, while this refers to the Tanjore district. Any attempt to explain away the wording of that Resolution by saying that Tanjore is not, like Bellary, affected by famine seems to be not very sound. If really any one wanted to support yesterday's proposition on the ground that famine affected Bellary, the straightforward and fair way for him would have been to bring an Amendment and say that as long as famine is there, the principle should be applicable there. The only Resolution that was carried was that till the codification of the principles of land revenue settlement was effected, Bellary should not have settlement. That means, Sir, that if the codification takes 10 years to be effected, then Bellary shall not have settlement during that period, whether famine continues there or not. Therefore, the effect of yesterday's Resolution is that whatever may be the state of the season in the Bellary district, we accept the principle that so long as codification is not completed, settlement shall not apply to that district. Therefore, having honestly accepted the principle that so long as codification is not effected, there should be no settlement for any district, which, I take it, is the paraphrase of yesterday's Resolution, I do not think it fair, nor does it lie in the power of any one, to say that, so far as Tanjore is concerned, that principle should not be applied because it is rich.

“ Yesterday, Sir, the hon. the Home Member threw a challenge to some of us, if I may say so, and asked ‘ are you prepared to say in this Council that although your district has been settled, you will allow other districts to go scot free ? ’ Well, Sir, this challenge has not been thrown

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [14th December 1923]

at us for the first time. The predecessor of the hon. Member threw the same challenge last year, and many of us accepted it and said that whatever might have been done in our districts, we did not want the other districts to suffer. He said that such a person would deserve his admiration, and what is more he asked us to go to the people for election after that. I was one of those who said that apart from this inter-district jealousy, apart from this inter-district divide-and-rule policy, brotherly feelings existed between members from all the various districts, and I was one of those that suggested that whatever might have been done as regards resettlement in some districts, at least the district in which there was no resettlement yet must have the benefit of the principle that no resettlement should take place until the principles of land revenue settlement were embodied in legislation. So I accepted the challenge, and, what is more, I went to my constituencies for election and stood first with the help of my hon. Colleagues and other friends there. Therefore, to raise this inter-district question and say because one district is settled, the other districts should not be allowed to have any benefit seems to be far-fetched. But we know what the effect will be of allowing the Government to go on with the settlement operations in district after district. I want hon. Members representing various districts, whether resettlement has taken place in their districts last year or some years ago, to recognize that once we allow the Government to effect this resettlement without restriction as to the codifications of the principles of revenue settlement, the only result will be that Government will go on postponing the codification because they know the later the codification, the better for them. They may postpone the codification for ever, and yet without the loss of a single pie they would go on settling district after district. I say that if that is allowed, there will be no codification for years to come, and it will be the turn of district after district to come under resettlement and even the district settled last year or this year would complete its round of thirty years and get its turn for resettlement. Therefore, if we are to safeguard the interests of various other districts, and even the interests of our own respective districts, though already settled, we should certainly bear in mind that we should have the codification effected at a very early date, and the only way to insist upon that early codification is by asking the Government to stop resettlement till it is done. Otherwise, Government will go on resettling district after district under the old *mamool*. Four years have elapsed since this principle of codification was enunciated and absolutely nothing has been done since. I am not here concerned about the Bill that is in preparation or anything like that. A Bill may be prepared in no time. The Religious Endowments Bill was prepared, brought to the Council and passed in a few months. But this short Bill of revenue settlement has been in existence for nearly two years, and nothing seems to have been done. I asked the question to the hon. the Home Member as to whether the then Revenue Member presided over the Committee for drafting the Bill as Revenue Member or in any other capacity, and the answer to that question is yet to come. The present Member in charge of Settlement must have the papers with him and he must be able to tell us if the hon. Sir Habib-ul-lah Sahib presided over the Committee as Revenue Member or in his own personal capacity. It, however, fell from the mouth of the Government Member that seven or eight experts were engaged in it. Even the present Labour Commissioner who had had experience in settlement work was probably in that Committee, as it was said that

14th December 1923] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

people with plenty of experience in settlement work had been on that Committee. Such a Committee had already made certain recommendations and yet those recommendations are still awaiting the attention of the Government. The hon. Member in charge of this question said that we should not expect him to accept the Bill blindfold. I asked the question as to how long he should be blindfolded. Two years have elapsed since this Bill has been finished. If the Government have still no idea of considering the matter, if they are still wanting to be blindfolded, if various questions come up in the meantime and yet they keep quiet over this Bill, there seems to be something wrong somewhere. If you take the history of this question in this House, what took place is this. The House practically passed a Resolution that no resettlement was to be effected till the codification was done. I take it that it was accepted by the Government and the Government no doubt for the time being accepted the proposition, but they did not do anything practically for the codification. Then we brought in a Resolution that we should have permanent settlement. When the Resolution for permanent settlement was carried by the House, the Government seemed to have changed their opinion as regards the original proposition of stopping resettlement till the codification of the principles, and then began this stage of settlement district after district. That means, Sir, that although they have got a Bill ready, although this House passed a Resolution two years ago that the codification of the principles must take place, still it has not been done, because they have become assured of the position that somehow or other without codification they can go on with resettlement. Therefore, Sir, we should stick up to that original principle stated not for the first time now, but stated two years ago, that no settlement should take place till the codification is effected. What we passed two years ago was repeated again yesterday. For various reasons we should stick up to that original Resolution; one of those reasons will be to insist on this Government to bring out this Bill at once and have the codification effected. Unless we do it, I am sure that we will find the codification eluding us and the Government will go on dealing with the settlement district after district. It is for this reason, and as a matter of consistency in our pressing for a principle two years old which was repeated again in the Resolution of yesterday, that I appeal to this House to pass this Resolution, and I also earnestly appeal to the Government to bring out this Bill at an early date."

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—" Sir, Mr. President, I support this Motion on principle. It is not a question whether one district can afford to have the assessment increased and another cannot. It is not a question whether one district is subject to devastations of famine and pestilence or another district is revelling in pleasure and plenty. Sir, it is not a question that one district is subject to or handicapped by uncertainty of rain on account of its climatic conditions or another district is subject to uncertainty of water-supply on account of the Kannambady project. Sir, I myself heartily congratulate the hon. Member in charge of Irrigation for having shown so much anxiety to expedite the irrigation works. Sir, our country is an agricultural country and our irrigation is in a very bad state. Sir, it is not again a question whether the ryot or the Government is to be bound legally by the thirty years' contract. It is not a question whether 12 lakhs of rupees that can actually be had from one district is to be lost sight of and a much less amount from another district is to be neglected. It is a question of principle,

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

[14th December 1923]

a principle that the principles of land revenue should be codified, a principle that our revenue settlement should be placed on a permanent basis. Sir, a Resolution was passed in this Council and carried by a large majority, 76 voting for and 17 against, that the principles of assessment should be codified before resettlement is undertaken. Sir, I appeal to the members of the Justice party (laughter) to support this principle of permanent settlement to which they pledged themselves in various confederations they had (hear, hear). Sir, I appeal to them now to vote for this Resolution. Even Sir Thomas Munro, the author of the ryotwari system, says in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons :

‘The principle of the ryotwari system is to fix an assessment upon the whole land of the country. This assessment is permanent. Every ryot who is likewise a cultivating proprietor of the land which he holds is permitted to hold that land at a fixed assessment as long as he pleases. He holds it for ever without any additional assessment.’

“Sir, many Secretaries of State, such as Lord Ripon, Lord Northcote and others, held that permanent settlement is good for the whole of India. Now, Sir, Bengal they say is prosperous to-day because there is permanent settlement there. If permanent settlement is good for Bengal, it is much more good for our province.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“May I point out that there is an Amendment on the paper specially relating to the permanent settlement. I am not sure whether you are aware of it, Sir. I think it would be more appropriate if permanent settlement were discussed when that Amendment comes on.”

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“I do not want this resettlement. We want once for all permanent settlement.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The Motion is that the principles of land revenue settlement should be embodied in legislation. The hon. Member's point is that he wants that legislation to be for a permanent settlement.”

The hon. Mr. A. R. KNAPP :—“There is on the paper a further Amendment proposing this permanent settlement. I thought that this discussion would be more appropriate then.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I think that what the hon. Member wants to say is that there is such a thing as permanent settlement and when this legislation is done it should provide for a permanent settlement. Is it not?”

Rao Bahadur C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“Yes, Sir (laughter).”

“The prosperity of our agricultural province depends upon the prosperity of our ryots, and our ryot is bled white. If they say that the price of corn is increasing, Sir, they lose sight of the fact that wages of labour and other necessities incidental to agriculture are also increasing. Moreover, Sir, there is another difficulty. Our contribution to the Central Government is based upon our land revenue, and our statesmen are not for expansion but for retrenchment. Now, this increase in land revenue will certainly attract the attention of the Central Government, and we are not going to have any reduction in our contribution either in the immediate present or in the distant future. With these words, Sir, I appeal not only to the Members on this side but also to the Members of the Justice party who have pledged themselves to this permanent settlement to vote for this Resolution.”

Mr. E. W. LEGH :—“I would ask whether the Amendment on the paper is going to be moved.”

499

SUSPENSION OF THE ENHANCED RATE OF LAND REVENUE IN THE
TANJORE DISTRICT

14th December 1923]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" Why should Mr. Legh put that question ? "

Mr. E. W. LEGH :—" I am only asking you, Sir, for information."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" I have no idea as to what is at the back of Mr. Venkatarama Ayyar. Probably if he were here, he would enlighten us. I see him here and I think he would do well to enlighten the House as to what he is going to do now."

Mr. VENKATARAMA AYYAR alias V. PANTULU AYYAR :—" I am not going to move my Amendment."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—" The House will now adjourn and meet again at 11 a.m. to-morrow."

The House then adjourned to meet again at 11 a.m. on Saturday, the 15th December 1923.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.



311 (1)
1301 (1)
-088 (1)
(38)

311 (1)
1301 (1)
-088 (1)
(38)

[14th December 1923]

APPENDIX.

[Vide page 471 supra.]

INSTANCES OF RESOLUTIONS DEALT WITH.

A.—In the pre-Reform Council.

- (1) 7th April 1910 ... "That the Madras Government may be pleased to appoint an Indian of proved merit and ability as a Member of the Madras Board of Revenue."

The hon. Mr. Hammick spoke for Government; the Motion was withdrawn.

- (2) 7th April 1910 ... "That an Indian be appointed as an Under Secretary to the Government of Madras as such an appointment has been listed as thrown open to Members of the Provincial Service."

The hon. Mr. Hammick spoke for Government; the Motion was lost.

- (3) 21st November 1916. "That this Council recommends to His Excellency in Council that for at least one Member's place in the Board of Revenue an Indian may be appointed."

The hon. Sir Alexander Cardew opposed the original Motion; it was subsequently amended and passed in its amended form.

The attitude of Government on each occasion.

B.—In the Reform Council.

- (1) 11th March 1921
(pages 830-32).

This Council recommends to the Government that the two posts of Conservators of Forests recently sanctioned by the Secretary of State for India may be reserved for officers of the Provincial Forest Service.

Opposed on the ground that the objects in view have already been fully secured by the decisions of the Government of India. Resolution was withdrawn. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson took part.

- (2) 2nd April 1921
(pages 1590-92).

This Council recommends to the Government that, with a view to giving effect to the recommendation of the Public Service Commission recruitment in Judicial offices may be made directly from the Bar and that such recruitment may be made for the next five years from amongst non-Brahman Hindus, Christians and Muhammadans so as to secure a due representation of all the different communities in the judicial service.

Opposed on the ground of limitations imposed by the Secretary of State. The hon. Sir K. Srinivasa Ayyangar took part.

14th December 1923]

INSTANCES OF RESOLUTIONS DEALT WITH—*cont.**B—In the Reform Council—cont.*The attitude of Government
on each occasion.

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>(3) 5th
August 1921
(pages 424
and 429).</p> | <p>That this Council recommends to the Government that a Standing Order to be issued <i>to every officer</i> or board or body of officers authorized to make appointments to the public service to give preference to candidates from the non-Brahman communities (including therein Christians, Muhammadans and members of the depressed classes) until a proportion of at least 66 per cent amongst offices carrying a salary of Rs. 100 per mensem and upwards and a proportion of 75 per cent amongst offices carrying a salary less than Rs. 100 are reached, within a period of seven years from this date so long as such candidates possess the minimum qualifications prescribed by the rules relating to appointments to the public services, although such candidates may be less qualified than Brahman candidates.</p> | <p>Resolution as amended by the Government, carried. The hon. Mr. A. R. Knapp took part.</p> |
| <p>(4) 3rd
September
1921 (pages
785 and 789).</p> | <p>That this Council recommends to the Government that appointments of assistant registrars of co-operative societies may be generally made from the senior grade tahsildars and last grade deputy collectors and that senior grade deputy collectors who are at present employed may be reverted to their permanent appointments.</p> | <p>The Government said that the matter was under consideration and the resolution was withdrawn. The hon. Sir (then Mr.) K. V. Reddi Nayudu, Development Minister, took part.</p> |
| <p>(5) 14th
September
1922 (pages
248-253-
255).</p> | <p>That this Council recommends to the Government that at least one Conservator of Forests, one Deputy Inspector-General of Police and one Member of the Board of Revenue be Indians.</p> | <p>The question of His Excellency's prerogative was referred to by the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter; but the point was not pressed. The hon. Mr. Knapp stated that he would advise His Excellency to appoint an Indian when practicable. The hon. Sir Habib-ul-lah Sahib, Revenue Member, took part.</p> |

14th December 1923] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiyar]

ment of Mysore. I hope the matter has been more or less settled by means of this despatch. Sir, we did not expect that the Metur project would come to the stage of being started so soon as this. We in the Coimbatore district expect that an opportunity will be given to raise the question whether at least some of the water that will be stored in the Metur reservoir will not be made available for the Coimbatore district. I believe, Sir, at one time there was a proposal to run a channel from the right bank of the reservoir into the Coimbatore district and irrigate some of the lands there. I believe the possibility of doing it has not been completely investigated or decided in any way finally. Now that the matter has come to a head, I request the hon. Member for Irrigation to consider this question also and see whether a portion of the water that is going to be stored at Metur cannot be made available for Coimbatore. By doing that there will be a double advantage. The Coimbatore district is a dry district and its inhabitants are sometimes very near famine. For instance, in the current year there has been no rain and in several portions of the district, the condition is very grave indeed. Cattle are being sold for a third of their purchase value. If a portion of the Coimbatore district can be irrigated with the water stored in the Metur reservoir, this state of things can be improved. If water is taken to Coimbatore, the same water can be utilized for half the acreage below the district, that is to say, the water that will be available for irrigating 50,000 acres in the Tanjore district can be made available for irrigating 50,000 acres in Coimbatore district and another 25,000 acres in Tanjore. So, in that way there will be a double advantage. The only thing we have to consider in this case is whether it will be possible to run a channel from the right bank of the Metur reservoir. So far as I have been able to make out, and so far as I have been able to consult the engineering opinion that was available, I understand that it is possible. So I earnestly request the hon. the Member for Irrigation to bear this in mind and have an investigation made as to the feasibility of this scheme. As I said already, these two schemes are big schemes and the sooner we bring them to a head and start them, the better for our Presidency. Therefore, we have really to be thankful to the hon. the Irrigation Member and not find fault with him for having come to a decision and started the schemes. With these words I very gladly support the main Motion."

The hon. Mr. C. P. RAMASWAMI AYYAR :—" Sir, in replying to the observations which fell from some of my hon Friends, will they permit me to thank them for their very helpful remarks, which will certainly be carefully borne in mind? Let me, in the first place, tell the hon. Member from Ganjam something with regard to the Girisola project. Sir, with regard to this the survey is complete. Earth-work has been ordered to be started and by the time we meet for the Budget, a very great deal of progress will, I am confident, have been made with regard to it.

" I shall next turn to Coimbatore. With regard to that, it is doubtless possible that by a system of channels that district may perhaps be benefited by the Metur reservoir. But it is too soon to say what exactly is going to happen. It will depend very much upon the amount of money we are able to get from the Government of India and the way in which we are able to fashion our reservoir and our channels. If our estimates are sanctioned in their entirety, I believe the reservoir may have enough storage to permit of that. I do not desire to give this as an assurance, but I am only mentioning it as a possibility.